NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCLXXVII.

APRIL, 1888.

THE HOHENZOLLERN KAISER.

A GREAT monarch, after a long, victorious, and brilliant career, has succumbed to the irresistible forces of Death. Yesterday powerful, admired, loved, revered, to-day he is dust. His historic shade alone remains; but this, uncrowned though it be, is luminous with admirable qualities, which will win to his memory the unfailing admiration, love and reverence of mankind. WILLIAM VON HOHENZOLLERN, King of Prussia, and first Emperor of Germany, by divine right communicated through the people, has passed. His character and all his acts now belong to the domain of History. His memory will not be intrusted to marble alone, but will warmly rest in the hearts of coming generations of his countrymen, and will be cherished wherever Christian civilization prevails.

He was the second son of Frederick William III., and of that Queen Louise whose brave struggle against the first Napoleon is remembered, and whose lovely portrait is familiar to the world. This fit mother of kings wrote of him, while he was yet a boy of ten years: "Our son William, if I am not deceived, will be simple, loyal, and full of good sense, like his father." Born March 22d, 1797, his cradling was in the midst of the frightful echoes of the French revolution. A few years later, the French Dictator crossed the Rhine, and after the battle of Jena drove the royal boy with his mother from Berlin to a refuge in Königsberg. About this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time, at the age of ten years, he received his first commission in the army as sub-lieutenant.

In 1810, the Queen died, prostrated by defeats, by the Napoleonic humiliations, by hopelessness and homelessness. The Prince continued his military studies, and at the age of sixteen began active service in the army at the side of his father, pursuing the French across the frontier, and finally witnessing the great ovation in England with which the allied subjugators of Napoleon were received in 1814.

During the years of peace which followed the devastating wars of Napoleon, the Prince had leisure for travel, and profited largely by the instruction which he derived from it. At home he became accustomed to the simplicity of life which prevailed at his father's court. Economy of expenditure was indispensable. Prussia was greatly impoverished, from King to humblest subject. The French occupation, the patriotic war, the interruption of all productive industries, had drained alike the public treasury and the private purse. At that time, and ever afterward, the Prince, King, Emperor led an unostentatious life, maintaining only so much social ceremony as was requisite for the dignity of a court. This simplicity of life, the absence of softening self-indulgence, his devotion to duty and disregard of personal luxury, accompanied by persistent industry, have drawn closer the bonds which united him to his once impoverished and always industrious people.

At the age of twenty he became a member of the Council of State, and was advanced to the colonelcy of a regiment; and in 1825 he was further promoted to be general of division. In the meantime, in 1822, he accompanied his father to the Congress of Verona, where the royal autocracy of Europe condemned the political liberalism of the continent, and asserted their right to crush it, not only in their own kingdoms but wherever it should appear—a declaration which had its influence in bringing Mr. Adams to the counter-declaration of the "Monroe Doctrine." In 1829 he married the eldest daughter of the Grand Duke of Weimar.

Noble in character and person as this princess was, the marriage was everywhere known to have been dictated exclusively by the interests of the state. The heart of Prince William had long since been seriously, even passionately, engaged to a very attractive and lovely Polish lady of an illustrious name. He long

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

persisted in his resolution to marry her. Unless born of a ruling family the statutes of his house prohibited the union. She was plainly not of royal lineage ; but learned men, in the interests of the Prince, sought to trace in her veins drops of the blood-royal of old Polish sovereigns. Other jurists denied the claim. It was then even proposed that she should be adopted as daughter by the bachelor brother of the late King of Prussia, thus making her a member of a royal family. The King's counsellors decided that this was no adequate substitute for descending blood. The statutes of the Hohenzollern house must be obeyed. There was no balance in the King's treasury for weighing royal hearts. The champions of the Prince were defeated at all points. The *coup de grace* was given by the Grand Duke of Weimar himself, whose younger daughter had married the younger brother of the Prince, and who now formally declared that if this Polish marriage should be completed, his court would assert the rights of the descendants of the younger branch to the Prussian crown, against those of the elder. The King appealed to the sense of duty in his son, and the cruel statute prevailed. At the age of thirty-two years the Prince gave his hand to this Lady of Weimar, whose intelligence and devotion to her royal and imperial duties have combined with his own to make his reign illustrious. But to the day of his death a Radziwill near his person and confidence has preserved the souvenir of the princess who was so near his heart.

In 1830 he received the command of the Prussian Corps of Observation sent to the Rhine in consequence of the Paris Revolution of July in that year. Ten years later the crown descended to his elder brother, Frederick William IV., who was already in middle life and childless. William, from this time, became the heir presumptive, and the object of more special interest on the part of his people. The new king appointed him President of the Council of Ministers, in addition to his rank and duty as President of the Council of State. While these functions did not withdraw him from his military interests, he was, nevertheless, much occupied, after the accession of his brother, by the rising questions of popular rights and liberties which were agitating the country and forcing the attention of the throne. The people were demanding of the new king the execution of the promises made to their fathers at the time of the expulsion of the French by the patriotic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

devotion of the Prussians. In that hope they had endured their heavy sacrifices of blood and treasure. The late king, alarmed by the prevalence of liberal principles on the continent and not willing to offend his autocratic allies, had failed to redeem these promises. His favorite and grim old soldier, Blücher, had said: "Let us not spoil with the pen what we have won by the sword." The king, however, had pledged himself in 1820 to a statute which prohibited new loans and taxes without consent of popular representation. For want of them now the national development could not proceed. The advocates of liberalism were numerous and clamorous, and embraced nearly the whole enterprising middle class, and the entire press of the country. A constitution and national parliament were demanded. King and Prince opposed it. The former so far gave way as to authorize the assembling of the eight provincial diets. A commission proposed, among other things, to give to the assembled diets the right of petitioning the King. The Prince, thinking this to be a dangerous innovation, opposed it; but, standing alone, he afterward yielded, with the observation: "Old Prussia is buried by the publication of this law. May the new Prussia become as powerful and great as was the old in the path of honor and of glory!"

In the light of the closing nineteenth century it appears to us impossible that at its beginning monarchs could have failed to perceive the immense re-inforcement of power which an enfranchised and loyal people could bestow on the government of a nation. In the absence of that perception, they treated their subjects as their antagonists in interest and in action. The small ruling class was alone trusted to advise and protect the executive power. Both King and Prince, born and bred in the principles of absolutism, holding that a few selfish intellects, with hereditary prejudices and selfish interests, were wiser than the entire mass of an industrious and educated people, struggled obstinately against the popular demands. "We will never consent," said the Prince in 1847, "to grant to the Diet liberties and rights to the prejudice of those of the Crown." The King declared that he would never consent that a written parchment should be interposed between himself and his people. This experimental session of the Diet closed in bad temper, the assembly demanding more rights, instead of manifesting the expected gratitude for the parsimonious installment granted to them. In this condition of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public sentiment the Paris revolution of 1848 surprised Europe, and again shook all the thrones of the continent except that of Russia.

This sudden blaze of French revolt kindled the liberal fires in Berlin. Clamorous crowds filled the streets. Prince William, more than the unstable King, was regarded as the resolute head of the autocratic party, and was the object of profound dislike to the masses of Berlin. The King, fearing aggressions from beyond the Rhine, had just ordered the Prince to turn over the command of the body guard at the capital, and take command on the frontier. All this had been done when the tumult burst forth in Berlin. Somebody ordered the troops to charge on the assembled people. The result increased the popular exasperation to fury. The order was wrongly attributed to the Prince-royal, while the party really responsible was only too glad to be sheltered under the royal wings. The populace shouted "Death to the Prince!" The more moderate demanded his abdication of his future rights to the crown. At night the mob rushed upon his palace, intending to plunder and burn it. It was saved by the Parisian ruse of its defenders, who exhibited on the front balcony, in large letters, the sign "*National Property.*" So bitter was the rage of the populace, so shattered were the royal councils, that the Prince's friends advised his immediate departure from the capital. The new ministry tendered the same advice. He replied that he would go into exile only upon the written order of the King. That order came in the form of a missive sending him to the English Court "to explain there the recent events in the Prussian capital."

Thus the Prince became an exile from his own country. Instead of availing themselves of his absence to soften and correct the public judgment against him, fear kept the Royalists silent. Interested leaders kept the resentment alive by wild reports that he was conspiring with the Czar to march an army on Berlin, and once even that he with the Russian army was approaching the gates of the city. The King was afterwards reported to have said: "In those days we were all lying on our bellies." The army was at fault, and the great wrath of the people was directed against the Prince as its chief.

Meanwhile William was in London, much fêted, and winning friendship and admiration by his intelligence, his frank manliness, and his *bonhommie*. The Prince Consort, Albert, at this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time wrote of him: "He is a noble, honest character, and quite attached to the new movement in Germany." He accepted the situation philosophically, and without moodiness. One day at dinner, when they were pushing to the table an arm-chair for him by way of personal distinction, he declined it with the smiling observation: "One must practice humility these days, when thrones are trembling."

This exile of the heir to the throne could not long be permitted, and especially while constitutional changes were under discussion affecting his hereditary rights. The liberal ministry feared its overthrow if an official recall should be sent to him. In various ways, however, his liberalized opinions were made public. The ministry finally advised his return, that his consent might be given to the measures proposed. One district elected him a deputy to the new Diet. He returned, and on the 8th of June he proceeded to take his seat in the Assembly, where the Conservatives alone arose as he entered, the Liberals receiving him seated and in silence. A remarkable spectacle,—the heir to absolute power seated as a member of a popular assembly, summoned to curtail and control his royal rights and privileges. So soon as the tribune was vacant the President gave the word to "the Deputy from Wirsitz." The Prince spoke briefly, and concluded with the following words: "The constitutional monarchy is the form of government which your King has recommended you to establish. I shall devote to it, with fidelity and conscience, all my strength, as the country has a right to expect from my character, which it knows well. Such is the duty of every friend of the Fatherland, such is especially mine as the first subject of the King. Under these conditions, may my presence among you be favorably received."

The discourse was listened to with plaudits on one side, with silence on the other. The Prince left the hall, and returned to it no more. So ended his exile, and so was he reintroduced to his countrymen. But many years were to elapse before Prince and people would stand on common ground, and with united hearts.

In October, 1857, the King was disabled by a stroke of apoplexy, and a regency became necessary. The old ministry, unwilling to surrender its authority, deferred the full regency provided by the Constitution, and persuaded the King to request his heir to administer the government temporarily in his name. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Prince's loyalty induced him on three successive occasions to yield to this request. Upon the fourth demand he refused, and would only accept the constitutional regency. It was conceded. He then summoned a new ministry, dismissing the Tory cabinet to whose policy he was personally opposed. This antagonism was known to the people, and his action went far to restore popularity to the Prince. He took his oath as constitutional Regent on the 26th of October, 1858. From that time he was King *de facto*. By the death of the infirm old King on the last night of the year 1860, the Regent became King *de jure*, January 1st, 1861.

During this regency the short and decisive war of Italy and France against Austria excited the attention of all the cabinets. The relations of Prussia and Austria were such that the former had no desire to increase the prestige of her neighbor, nor to strengthen her grasp on the German federated states. On the other hand was the danger of strengthening the hostile power beyond the Rhine. The Regent's government steered a middle course, rebuking the Italian government for its disregard of the treaty of 1815, and troubling France by a corps of observation on the Rhine. There was one Prussian diplomat who at that time saw a wiser course of action for the interests of Prussia, and wrote of it in earnest language; but he was not yet Prime Minister. He was hunting bears with the Czar of Russia. His day was to dawn not long after. He clearly read in Italian unity the historic example for German unification. The Regent's government meanwhile was blinded by the traditions of 1815, and the recollections of Verona.

From this period William I. was preoccupied with one great solicitude, the reorganization of the Prussian army. The success and glory of Prussia had been won by her arms. The efficiency and strength of her army must be advanced. The King's military perception of its present needs was sharpened by his observation of the military operations in Italy. His efforts to remedy its defects were constant and energetic. The army question was then and has ever since continued to be the rock of dissension on which all proposals of union between the King and the Liberal party have been wrecked. The popular mind thoroughly appreciated the evils of conscription and taxation which were associated with a great military establishment. It would not correspondingly appreciate the dangers lurking in international relations and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ambitions, supported by a powerful military régime abroad. It seems the King would have admitted the Liberals to the power of Government if he could have found in them a hearty support of those measures of military reorganization which he believed indispensable to the preservation of Prussian rights against national rivalries on the south and west. He was resolved to exhaust all his constitutional rights, and even all his reserved hereditary powers, in the effort to elevate the Prussian army to the first rank, both in organization and in arms. This, and the maintenance of the executive prerogatives of the throne against all encroachments of the legislative branch of the Government, were the two strong purposes with which he began his reign. He would loyally observe his promises as Regent, and his obligations as constitutional Sovereign, but would take no step further in diminution of the powers which descended to him with the crown. In order to emphasize this resolution before all Germany, he proceeded for his coronation to Königsberg, where the first King of Prussia had been crowned 160 years before, and whither none since had gone to be crowned. To show that he meant to hold the power by divine right, he with his own hands took the crown from the altar and placed it on his head.

All this seemed to accentuate in the national mind the anti-liberal policy and purpose of the King. The masses of the intelligent middle class being fully impregnated with the principles of modern progress, this coronation awakened no enthusiasm, and his reign began, and for years continued, with a struggle against the principles of the age. Parliament refused him the laws and the credits which he required for the reorganization and increase of the army. Undeterred by this opposition, he fell back upon his general constitutional and retained powers, and proceeded with the reorganization, collected the usual taxes, and appropriated them to the public service according to the pre-existing budget.

There are few qualities of a sovereign so important as the power to discover and appreciate fit characters for the chief administrative functions. The possession of this faculty in a ruler is itself a quality of greatness. William I. has by this, as much as by his personal character, illuminated his career, and attracted the admiration of the world. For the execution of his plan of military reformation he found General von Roon, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

placed him at the head of the Department of War. To direct his forces in discipline and campaign he discovered General von Moltke, and put him at the head of his staff. The first nobly accomplished his task, and died some years before the King. The other still lives in a vigorous old age, loved and honored to the last by his royal chief, and with a military fame as wide as the world. Guided by these great administrators, and encouraged by the deep interest of the monarch, the army rapidly approached perfection.

But there remained a civil function equally important with the military, for which an equally able executive must be found. Foreign relations developed the burning questions of the time. Diplomacy could engender or avert war, gratify national pride, or produce national humiliation like that of Olmütz. Where should the King find the ideal man? It was in the autumn of 1862 that his famous trinity of chiefs was completed by summoning Otto von Bismarck to the presidency of his ministry.

Now proceeded in earnest the struggle with Austria for the leadership of the powerful German race. Vienna looked at Berlin and smiled at the pretensions of a Government which could not obtain from its own parliament either a military bill or a budget. They knew little of the creative vigor newly introduced into that Government. The haughty insistence upon the old order of things by the one power was now met by the other with a peremptory demand for a change. When change, in form, without substance for Prussia, was offered by the South, the North met it with positive refusal. Austria found in the new Prussia a rock on which the old federal barque was certain to be wrecked. The King's diplomacy had entirely changed in character. It had become precise and resolute instead of academic and verbose. There was a smell of gunpowder in every envelope addressed by Berlin to Vienna. The Austrian control of the German Federation approached its crisis.

The Danish War (1863–'5) into which German popular feeling forced both Prussia and Austria, compelled a truce to their diplomatic struggle, and for a time united their arms. But their conquests (as yet unjustified by rightful history) introduced new elements of discord and bitterness over the disposition of the spoils of war, which were settled only by the war of 1866 with Austria. Let it be recorded to the honor of King William that he under-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

took both these wars with reluctance. The farther-seeing and less scrupulous statesmanship of his great minister prevailed. By the astounding victory of Königsgrätz, won under the eyes of the King, Austria was expelled from her place in the German Federation, and the Danish provinces gave to Prussia the coveted territory and ports on the two northern seas. The German standard was transferred from the hands of Francis Joseph to King William.

This sudden and complete success of Prussia in an active campaign of thirty days against a great military power, and her rapid diplomatic agreements with the German states which had been allied with Austria, amazed Europe. For military purposes Prussia sprang into the first rank of nations, having added to her own disciplined and splendid columns the forces of numerous minor states of Germany. France was greatly excited, but in the diplomatic struggle which followed was finally worsted, and left to nurse her wrath for the future. Every effort was made by William and by his minister to re-conciliate Austria, and to appease the wounded sensibilities of the South German governments. With the latter secret treaties were soon afterward signed, which put their important military strength into alliance with Prussia in case of the apprehended war with France.

The stream of events now paused at an epoch which gave breathing time, and space for reflection. The monarch who had been a secondary power in Europe had become great, and foremost in the observation of the whole continent. He could not have been more amazed at the rapidity of his elevation than he should have been at the transformation of his own political views and relations. He began his royal career, in 1861, with a fixed determination to hold fast his alliance with Russia, to keep friendship with Austria, to make only "moral conquests" in Germany, to adhere to the principles of divine right in hereditary monarchs, and to preserve the basis of territorial adjustments defined by the European Congress of 1815. In 1867 he found himself shaken from all save the first of these policies. He had himself been an effective agent in the humiliation of his Austrian neighbor, whom he had overthrown in war. He had recognized the new kingdom of Italy based on popular suffrage,—the divine right of the people; indeed had allied himself with this people's monarch to take jewels from the consecrated crown of the Austrian Empire. In aid of this enterprise he had even come to an understanding with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the French Emperor, who was an original and entire creation of universal suffrage; for without his consent Victor Emanuel would not enter into alliance with even the legitimate Prussian Crown. He had overthrown hereditary German princes. By his own hand the remaining half of the treaty of 1815 was torn to shreds.

History, as interpreted by modern right, cannot condemn him for this acceptance of its principles. The law of the union of a race in self-defense, and for their common welfare, is now held to be of diviner origin than the right of a single individual to subjugate a race, or to wear its crown. Instead of this condemnation, history will admire the loyal hesitations which attended his conversion, and which display an honorable fear lest self-interest should obtain control over honorable convictions of duty. His conversion was further proved and consummated by the acceptance of a parliament elected by universal suffrage. Victor Emanuel and Italian unity had become, in fact, the model for William I. and German unity. The great Cavour was the precursor of the greater Bismarck. As the latter said to the Italian Ambassador in Paris, "If Italy did not exist, it would be necessary to invent it!"

The King was well aware, and the future historian will affirm it, that the Prussian diplomatic triumphs immediately following the victory of Sadowa were due to the unmatched sagacity and boundless energy of this great minister, whose courage and rapidity of action were equal to those of the army. Neither Cæsar in the military velocity of his Gallic campaigns, nor the first Napoleon in his surprises of a dilatory enemy, win more of our admiration than this grand diplomatist deserves for the swiftness with which his genius crystallized into treaties and alliances with the German states the fruits of the great victory of Sadowa. When Europe, which was expecting an undoubted Austrian victory, awakened from the stupor into which the complete triumph of Prussia in the battle-field had plunged her cabinets, she saw a military union effected in Germany under the control of the Prussian King, who was now ready to confront the most powerful of his enemies. When the echoes of the needle gun died in the ears of Frenchmen, their Government, which had placidly awaited the moment when it should limit the results of the contest and receive its own territorial compensations, found only the words of despair, Too late! Too late!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

King William had now more than realized the primary objects of his rupture with Austria. He had undisputed control of the Duchies and their ports. The movements of his troops in Germany could no more be obstructed, north of the Main, by interjacent and hostile princes and kings. The cumbrous, dilatory and inimical Federal Diet no longer existed. The South German states were his military allies. All his prayers, all his desires were now for peace with all the world. Neither the German race, brave as it is, nor its royal chief loved war for its own sake. That union of the race which had long been the aspiration of the people was now nearly accomplished. The proposal of this war with Austria had been threateningly unpopular; but under the blazing illumination of their military and diplomatic victories the patriotic ardor of the people elected a Parliament which promptly voted the supplies, and gave complete indemnity to the government for their illegal financial operations during the period when the budget had been refused. Grateful to the Divine Providence which had thus bountifully realized his hopes, William sought to consolidate the elements of peace in all international relations. For some years he was wholly successful.

But France did not recover from the unexpected defeat of her hopes of advantage from the Austro-Prussian contest. She felt herself humiliated by her neighbor's greatness. A certain national envy poisoned her breast. As one of her statesmen put it, "A nation, without becoming less, may be diminished by the aggrandizement of her neighbors." The Cabinet was worried. Anti-dynastic clamor increased the discontent of Paris. The French Emperor had a certain satisfaction in having snatched Venice from the contest, and thus completed his work for Italy; but Frenchmen wanted more than this sentimental satisfaction. They demanded territorial compensation for themselves. They made unwearied demands on Prussia for indemnity on the Rhine, on the Belgian border, somewhere, anywhere. Prussia, after a semblance of yielding, from the moment when her military alliances with South Germany were completed, assumed a resolute tone: "No, not an inch of German soil." France then sought satisfaction in Luxembourg; but, on the eve of success, the King of Holland declined, and the Paris Cabinet was defeated at all points. Prussia proceeded with the work of domestic and federal organization, but was often interrupted by French remon-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strances charging the Cabinet of Berlin with violations of the treaty of Prague by her arrangement with the South German states, and in her treatment of Schleswig. This had no other effect than to irritate the government of the King. Finally, Paris began negotiations at Vienna and Florence for an alliance offensive and defensive against Germany.

In this condition of affairs a new cause of irritation arose. The Constituent Assembly at Madrid was searching Europe for a King to rule that distracted country. Several royal lines were in vain invited to furnish a candidate for that throne, when General Prim turned to the Catholic branch of the Hohenzollerns of Prussia, and invited Leopold to accept the crown. King William, as head of the family, gave his assent to the candicacy, but without in any manner committing his Government to the proposition. The affair was soon made known at Paris by way of Madrid, and had the effect of a blazing torch in a magazine of powder. Paris was immediately ablaze. Imperialists, Republicans, Radicals, all shared the excitement. A Hohenzollern on the southern border of France as well as on the East—impossible, monstrous!

The French Ambassador, Benedetti, was dispatched to the King, at Ems. The truthful monarch told him the simple facts, involving no other participation on his part than a consent to the candidacy invited by Spain. For eight days there was a storm of telegraphic dispatches between Paris and Ems. From the first the King expressed his willingness to see the Prince retire. The French Cabinet insisted that he should himself forbid his acceptance. The King replied that having once given his consent he could not go back on his word, which had been communicated to Spain. But he would inform the Prince's father of the situation, and upon receiving his reply he would immediately inform the French Ambassador of the result. Instead of granting time for this communication the French ministry grew more and more pressing and peremptory. The King preserved his moderation of temper, and his position. Without unnecessary delay the young Prince's father telegraphed to Madrid that in view of the existing complications his son's candidature was withdrawn. From Madrid this was immediately telegraphed to Paris, before King William had received his reply. As soon as he received the response addressed to himself he made it known to the French Ambassador.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the Duc de Grammont, apparently bent on war, instructed his Ambassador to demand from the King a pledge that the candidacy should not be renewed. The King replied that the withdrawal had his entire approbation, and needed nothing more. The demand for a positive royal pledge that the candidacy should never be renewed was repeated. The King, convinced that the desire existed at Paris to inflict a personal humiliation on himself, replied that the candidacy had been withdrawn with his unreserved approval, and without any *arrière pensée*, and more he could not say; and any further negotiations must be conducted through his Government. The Ambassador demanded his passports and took his formal leave at the railroad station, as the King was departing for Berlin.

On this minute point, involving neither her interest nor her honor, France proceeded to war, and suffered that defeat and dismemberment which constitute one of the tragic chapters of human history. Her Emperor lost his throne, while the German King won an imperial crown under the walls of Paris, and in the very palace which treasured the ancient glories of France. The crown of Charlemagne, withdrawn from the Hapsburgs and for sixty years suspended, now rested on the head of a Hohenzollern in the royal halls of Versailles.

The newly crowned German Emperor was himself amazed at the rapidity and the grandeur of the events which had borne him on their tide to an elevation far beyond his original ambition and his hopes. A firm believer in Divine Providence, he in his address to the officers attributed his success to that Divine Power "who has permitted us to be the instruments for accomplishing such high historic deeds." In announcing to the Empress the convention with France, which secured to Germany the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, and the great war indemnity, he rendered homage to the "God of armies, who has everywhere blessed our undertakings, and given us success in a peace so honorable." To his ally in arms, the King of Saxony, he expressed his satisfaction "at the end of a war which was imposed upon us with a frivolity without parallel." To his imperial nephew of St. Petersburg he dispatched a glowing message of thanks, because by his efforts the war had been kept within narrow limits. "Prussia will never forget it. God bless you for it!" And then, after this and other grateful recognitions of the powers of heaven

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and of earth by whose aid his magnificent achievements were accomplished, he broke up his quarters at Versailles, and departed for his own states. On arriving at their border he gave answer to the congratulations offered him, with quiet modesty and generosity: "For myself, I have been able to do but little; the wisdom of Moltke and the intelligence of the generals have brought about the success which we have won."

The patriotic emotion excited by the war, the common shedding of German blood and their united deeds of arms, the universal joy of victory, all these had for a time welded the different sections of the German race, north and south, into fraternal relations. Party differences were at first almost silenced. But as time wore on troublesome internal questions began again to awaken the sensibilities of party. The government demanded a large military organization. The Empire had been created and the German union established by the army. By the army it must be maintained. Said Moltke: "What we have won in six months we must defend for fifty years. Our disarmament would be equivalent to war." Finally, the Emperor's policy prevailed, and in 1875 he could place himself, in case of war, at the head of two millions of armed men. But Parliament, while demanding other reforms, which were refused, grew more and more hostile, and the radical elements increased and the debates grew more bitter. Popular passions, in 1878, had become again greatly excited.

On the 11th of May of that year, a socialist assassin attempted the life of the Emperor, and failed. But on the 4th of June another repeated the attempt and grievously wounded the venerated monarch. The shock to all men of noble sentiments in the civilized world was very great. Prince Bismark, in an interview with General Grant, who was then in Berlin and expressed his horror of the crime, avowed the substantial feeling of the masses of Germans, and of all good men of other races. "Here is an aged man," said he, "one of the best men on the face of the earth; yet they attempt his life. Never has a man existed of a character more modest, more generous, more humane. . . . . It is not possible to find a finer type of gentleman, more noble, more amiable, more beneficent, ornamented with all the high qualities of a prince and the virtues of a man. I believed the Emperor could traverse his empire alone, and without the least danger. And yet, look, they try to kill him!" The world was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

again shocked in 1883 by a third attempt on the Emperor's life at Rüdesheim, while he was inaugurating a great patriotic monument to the honor of the German race.

In both his functions, as King and as Emperor, William repeatedly found himself in a sea of trouble. He persistently refused any interpretation of either constitution, royal or imperial, which conferred on the ministry, as in England, the power to govern with its related responsibility to the Legislature. He often protested that he had not given up, and would never abandon the hereditary right to rule, as well as to reign. The legislative bodies had their functions, but they did not include in any form the executive power. They could censure his ministry, and could refuse proposed laws, and budgets; but they could not overthrown his ministers. His Cabinet was responsible to himself, and not to the law-making power. Again and again he threw the weight of his great personality upon the consideration of pending questions, and claimed the right of participation in all appeals to the elective constituency. He would not agree to stand aloof from any popular interest, insisted on his right of contact with the people, and preferred to accept the consequences of hostility rather than rest in the lofty and inaccessible regions of irresponsibility, where many modern potentates have chosen to dwell, and find a lazy repose. When his loyal servants in the Cabinet were denounced and censured, he was prompt to cover them with the mantle of his great authority. While this loyalty to his own conscience created hostility to himself, which might have been averted by taking refuge in the cold realm of irresponsible inaction, his gallantry as a man, and the warm personality of his greatness, on the other hand, kindled an affectionate and personal interest in his people.

These great elements of his character were especially visible in his relation to the army. Every soldier of the little bands which daily marched by his palace in their rounds of duty, as they saw his paternal eye watching their movements from the famous *eckfenster* of his working room, felt that the sympathy of the man, as well as the eye of a king, was interested in their conduct. Every corps and regiment in their annual manœuvres knew that the heart of their King was with them, and swelled like their own with pride in observing the magnificent power and perfection of their drill. All his life a soldier, from his first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

youthful decade, and by preëminence a commander-in-chief, he might have appropriated to himself the glory of his victories; but he willingly saw the historical halo pass to the heads of his great generals. Progressively successful beyond all royalties of his long epoch, he never lost the balance of his upright and loyal character, nor the companionable simplicity of his early manhood. No vain desire to humiliate his adversary ever followed a victory; rather a wish to heal the sensibilities his sword had wounded. He dreaded the shedding of German blood in fratricidal strife. Every other available hope must be exhausted before the final appeal to war. When that appeal was made, his home was with the army, his confidence in God, and his heart with his soldiers. Neither in peace nor in war did he seek the indulgence of ease and luxury. His palace never became the centre of social extravagance or enervating enjoyments. So much of courtly entertainment as his royal state required was given, and no more. His cabinet of work, looking on the monumental plaza, was his chosen room, and there was the centre of his daily interests. All this his people knew, and not without appreciation of its significance. Upon rumor of his illness, it was always before that window that his people appeared, and waited for the sight of his familiar and venerable face.

His personal participation in the dangers of a military campaign was not due to any calculated motive of giving inspiration to the soldiers by his presence. His heart drew him to their side, to the scene of their suffering, their peril and their glory. For, as he proudly said to General Grant, in 1879, "I, too, am a soldier." He was no conqueror of the Asiatic or Napoleonic type, loving destruction, waste and conquest and the acquisition of personal glory for their own sake. So soon as his campaign had accomplished its national object, he was more eager for peace than was his enemy. It was in reluctant obedience to the almost universal demand of the German race that he entered into the Danish contest. It was with the greatest difficulty, and after years of fruitless negotiations, that he was persuaded by his minister to embark in the Austrian war. Before his last and greatest campaign he advanced to the verge of self-humiliation to avoid the impending struggle with Napoleon III. After 1871, in the fullness of his greatest prestige and honor, he was prompt to make known to Europe that his empire would be devoted to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interests of European peace. He kept his word. Again and again has the wise intervention of his imperial counsel averted a general conflagration, and brought hostile powers to a pacific adjustment of their grievances. When rumors of European wars arose, the eyes of all the Continents involuntarily turned to the government of Emperor William for the preservation of peace. For seventeen years his imperial rule has been a benediction to the peace-loving world.

If there be those in hades who shall meet this great shade with a reproachful exhibition of their wounds received in the brief months of his wars, there are many more entering that dark realm who may encounter the same noble shadow with blessings on their lips for their long untroubled years of peace.

What demons of war shall be unchained by his death we do not know. Loyal, honorable, courageous, patriotic and peace-loving, beyond all doubt, is his successor. Conscientious and brave as Frederick William is, and German to the core, can he, or, in fact, any successor, meet the waiting storm from beyond the Rhine as the great Kaiser met it, and conduct another German army to the gates of Paris? History holds her plume in hand to write the answer.

JOHN A. KASSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY AM I A MOSLEM?

"IN THE NAME OF GOD, THE MERCIFUL, THE COMPASSIONATE."

HAVING, by the unbounded mercy of Him, who is the Protector and Guardian of the believer, traversed round the world in search of enlightenment, and by His bounteous mercy enjoyed a liberal education in eastern and western languages, whereby I have been able to catch a few of the sprays of knowledge as they waft through the wide universe from the Great Fountain of Truth, I gratefully accept of the invitation to answer the question "Why am I a Moslem?"

It is the very question which was put to me more than a quarter of a century ago by a half-educated teacher of Christianity as he stood preaching in the streets of Agra. It is a question which I have often put to myself as I studied the English Bible. It is a question which has been asked me by many intelligent gentlemen during my travels in Europe and America. What apprehensions of soul, what anxieties of mind, what yearnings of spirit this important inquiry has cost me none other knoweth save my own heart, and that God "who is nearer to us than our jugular vein." How often has my heart burned with indignation when I have heard the name of my Prophet (upon whom be peace!) slandered by unthinking men, or have read the strange misrepresentations of the Moslem's faith as recorded in the polemical works of Christian writers! The old bigotry of the Crusaders has not died out, and Islam has still, in its condition of apparent hopeless helplessness (foretold by the prophet), to bear with patient submission all that dominant Christianity dares to say or do regarding it. Nearly every book written against Islam drives the inquiring mind into the barren ocean of atheism, for they take from under their feet the basis of belief in an inspired record and cast one anchorless and rudderless on the sea of doubt. Had it not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been for the broad and liberal teaching of the Honorable Siyyid Ahmad Khan, C. S. I. of Alighur in North India, I should long since have lapsed into an atheistic condition of mind, for the schools of the London University and the moral conditions of London society are not calculated to establish one's belief in supernatural religion.

It was that enlightened teacher, the Hon. Siyyid Ahmad Khan, that many years ago took my English Bible and opened to the words of the Christian Apostle Peter, and read: "God is no respecter of person, but in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him." Although I had read the Christian Bible for some years that wonderful verse of inspired truth had never been shown me by a single Christian teacher. It was a Moslem who first taught me the all comprehensive breadth of Christianity, and with it that eclectic spirit of the Prophet of Islam, whereby the teachings of the Arabian Prophet can be harmonized and reconciled with those of the Nazarene.

As I have witnessed the mystic rites of Buddhist worship at Osaka in Japan, the whimsical gyrations of dancing dervishes at Cairo, the gorgeous processions of the Vatican, and the crowded church congregations of Protestant London, I had to reconcile it all with the mystic worship of Mecca, or either plunge into the vortex of infidelity or lie stranded on the barren shores of agnosticism. But the Hon. Suyyid Ahmad Khan had placed in my hand a key whereby I could unlock the darkened chamber of religious contradictions, and with the Light of God's Truth discover that in the midst of human error the path of God can be clearly seen. Both the prophets of Christianity and of Islam were eclectics, and it is only when the seeker after God discovers this that he can find that rest and repose of mind which is expressed in the word *Moslem*,—"one resigned to God's will." That which obscures the light is the dense dark cloud of religious bigotry and strife which has arisen between Moslems and Christians ever since the days of the Crusades.

I have been told by an esteemed English friend (a well-known student of the religious systems of the East), that the Christians of America and Great Britain will be shocked at the very thought of any educated person defending the doctrines of Islam; for whilst Buddhism, with its positive atheism and idolatry, can claim a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

respectful consideration amongst English speaking races, the religion of Mohamed, with all its grand conceptions of God, is regarded as too gross and too sensual to admit of a consistent defense. And I readily believe it, for no man can read, as I have done, those ignorant and bigoted attacks on the faith which are scattered broadcast over British India, or the numerous English anti-Moslem works in the British Museum, without feeling assured that the day has not yet come (although it is drawing near), when the despised Moslem can obtain an impartial hearing.

And yet it was Islam which inspired the minds of such men as Ibu Sina (Avicenna), Abul Walid (Averroës), Abu Bakr (Avempace), and Al Ghazali, and enabled them to retain a knowledge of God amidst the abstractions of philosophical research. It was Islam that crushed a corrupt form of Christianity, and for centuries led the van of the nations in the march of literature and science. It was Islam which drove out atheistic Buddhism from Central Asia and the whole of India, and gave to wild and uncivilized tribes a knowledge of the true God. And it is Islam which still defies the efforts of wealthy missionary corporations (animated for the most part by strong party considerations rather than with a desire to propagate truth), and still claims the homage and devotion of 180 millions of the human race. Every Friday converts to Islam from heathenism are received by hundreds in the great cities of India, while even Christians are compelled to admit that Islam is spreading with marvelous rapidity through the whole continent of Africa. Modern Christianity, clothed, as it is, in the hateful garb of the conqueror, can never establish itself in the East, nor can it with its ascetic demands suit itself to the requirements of savage races.

The more the religion of the Moslem is investigated, the more does it claim the respectful homage of those who study its teachings. John Louis Burckhardt, a Swiss Protestant, was one of the first Europeans who made a pilgrimage to Mecca, and after years of study he died a faithful Moslem, and was buried at Cario. Palgrave, in his "Travels in Arabia," manifests much bigotry regarding Islam, but in his "Essays on Eastern Questions" his views are completely changed. Mr. Bosworth Smith, one of the Christian teachers of the great school at Harrow, studied Islam as a scholar, and is forced to admit that Mohamed is a "very

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prophet of God." There are not 200 converts from Islam to Christianity in the whole world, and of the eighty Moslems baptized in Constantinople not one has remained firm in his new faith.

But we are told Islam persecutes! Stay, my Christian brother! I have visited Smithfield where Christians were burnt by Christians, and I have stood on Boston Common where Christian Puritans hanged Christian Quakers, and I find in America that religious liberty is not yet extended to the Mormons. Islam has never professed complete religious toleration, but even Christian writers admit that the Saracen Arabs who conquered Jerusalem and Damascus and subdued the whole of Syria and Persia, were a brave and generous race, friendly to Christians, content to place them under certain restrictions, and exacting from them a small tribute for protection, *but ever extending to them freedom of worship*. When the Moslem conqueror Walid seized Damascus he even allowed Christians and Moslems to worship in the same church. Islam is called by Christians the "religion of the sword," but there is not a religion on the face of the earth that has not been propagated by conquest and sustained by intolerance. When the Turcomans of Central Asia embraced Islam, they conquered and slaughtered the Saracens of Syria long before they threatened the borders of Christendom. Religious liberty is a modern invention unknown to the ancients, and even now it is a question whether the civil magistrate would view with indifference the conversion of Boston to the religion of Mohamed! But it is asserted that Mohamedanism is immoral! That is, the slavery of Egypt is immoral but not that of Virginia; the divorce of Baghdad is immoral but not that of Chicago; the polygamy of Bokhara is immoral but not the drunkenness of London. So immoral is Islam that Mr. Gladstone would drive it "bag and baggage to to Baghdad," although it must be admitted that the Christians of Bulgaria are not much better than the Moslems of Constantinople, and that the sober and abstemious legions of the Sultan are as reputable, although polygamous, as the British regiments of India with their licensed prostitution. Anti-Moslem literature is always based on the assumption that Moslem countries are so infinitely below Christian countries in morality. It is a pure assumption, as every Moslem can testify after a few weeks residence in Paris, London, or New York. Uncivilized Moslems are superior to uncivilized Christians in their standard

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of morality, and if under more civilized conditions of life the natural outcome of Islam has been an unlimited license regarding marriage and divorce; the outcome of the teachings of Christianity has been an unlimited degree of intemperance, with unparalleled prostitution in large centres of population. The Nazarenes should learn the lesson their master taught them, not to cast the stone; or as the Holy Koran saith, "O, ye believers, avoid frequent slanders, for slanders are a crime."

But all this may be considered a digression from my subject. For I am called upon to explain, why I, an educated man, reading and speaking western languages, and having traveled into all parts of the civilized world, can still declare myself a believer in the mission of Mohamed and give my assent to the creed "there is no deity but Allah, and Mohamed is His messenger." It is a question constantly asked me by ladies and gentlemen of all stations and ranks in life, and I find the mysterious folds of my turban and the buttonless arrangement of my pijamahs, kurta, and khiftan excite far less astonishment than the strange fact that I after listening to the persuasive eloquence of a Liddon, a Spurgeon and a Talmage can yet declare that I am "a Moslem," a believer in the Koran and all its peculiar dogmas and practice. It is years since my pious father instilled into my youthful mind the five great duties of the true Moslem, belief in God, the need of prayer, the blessings of benevolence, the benefits of abstinence, and the solemn duty of paying a pilgrimage to Mecca once in a lifetime; and in the six great dogmas of faith, the unity of God, the inspiration of prophets, the revelation in books, the ministry of angels, the reality of future punishment, and the duty of resignation to the decrees of the Almighty. They were presented to my youthful mind as mere dogmas, and oftentimes has my faith been staggered as I have seen them misrepresented in Christian books; but whilst education and travel have vastly expanded my views regarding their true interpretation, I find in them all that is needed to discipline the human soul to that condition which is expressed in the word "Moslem"—"one who is resigned."

Islam is a comprehensive system, for when it is asserted "Mohamed is the Messenger of God," it is not intended to imply that he is the only prophet. Our Moslem writers admit that up to the Mohamedan era there had been not fewer than 124,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prophets, of whom 315 were special "Apostles" of religious systems. It is evident, therefore, that Mohamed never intended to inculcate the narrow views of the Christian and the Jew regarding inspiration. In the Koran itself the prophetical character of Lukman, Heber, and Zu'l Karnain is admitted, and it would be consistent with this broad spirit of interpretation to call Socrates, Plato, and even Gautama the Buddha "prophets of God."

Nor is Islam anti-Christian, for Mohamed's profound reverence for the mission and work of Jesus is evident in every page of the Koran. Mohamed never claimed for himself a higher title than "the servant and messenger" of the Most High, but he dignified the Redeemer of Israel with the titles of *Al Maseeh*, the Christ, *Kalimat Ullah*, the Word of God, and *Ruh Ullah*, the Spirit of God. The Koran, it is true, does not teach the Trinity (nor does the Gospel), but the true Moslem, in his conceptions of the mysterious nature of God, is far nearer the Trinitarian than the Unitarian, inasmuch as he is taught to believe that the "Light of Mohamed" existed before the creation of time.

Mohamed never contemplated the overthrow of Christianity, for he taught his followers to wait patiently for the second advent of Jesus. The minaret of the mosque at Damascus on which Jesus will descend and the open space near the tomb of Omer for the burial place of the Christian prophet are but confirmations of this popular belief. But there is no project of Islam ever giving place to Christianity. Islam is essentially an oriental religion and suited to the conditions of oriental life. It adapted itself to the civilization of Baghdad and Cordova in its golden age, and it has planted itself on the ruins of a coarse and effete idolarity in Central Asia, and taught the wild tribes of Turkistan the worship of the living God. Eastern races take unkindly to the peculiar phases of Christianity forced upon them by English and American missionaries, for while modern Christianity seems to adapt itself to the conditions of fashionable European life, it is to the Eastern mind but a parody on the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, who was in thought and life an Oriental among Orientals.

The claims of Mohamed as a commissioned prophet of God are historic. His position as such rests on as firm historic basis as that of Moses, who is his own historian, or of Jesus, whose historic identity rests on the testimony of his own disciples. In proof of this let the English reader peruse Mr. Arthur Gilman's "Story of the Sara-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cen," in which the simple narative of Mohamed's inspiration is graphically told. The whole story is as real and life-like as that of the birth of Jesus. Mohamed, the prophet, is no myth. The time was when the Prophet of Islam was stigmatized as an "impostor," but European critics are now beginning to see that to reject Mohamed as a sincere man would necessitate a rejection of the historic Christ.

The character of Mohamed has been too often attacked by unscrupulous and unthinking men. Dean Prideaux, who found no difficulty in accepting the inspiration of a David or even a Solomon, is largely responsible for the gross misrepresentation of the Prophet's character. The Prophet of Arabia never professed to be a perfect man. But it was he who, in the midst of a licentious and polygamous people, lived purely with one wife, and that wife his senior in age by many years. His ten marriages, contracted after he was fifty-three years of age, were formed chiefly from a desire for male progeny as well as to extend protection to widows of vanquished enemies and to strengthen his relationship with leading families; a custom common to all Oriental nations. The Prophet is charged by Christian writers (who seem to be perfectly oblivious to the enormity of "righteous Lot's" grievous sin and the strange peculiarities of David's deathbed) with two flagrant sins: his connection with Mary, his Coptic slave, and his marriage with Zainab, the divorced wife of his foster son, Zaid. In neither of these transactions does the Moslem see the least moral delinquency. Mary was as lawful to Mohamed as Hagar was to Abraham, and Zainab was afforded protection by the Prophet after her divorce from her unamiable consort. The Prophet is also charged with cruelty, but what cruelty compared with the wholesale slaughter of the Canaanites? In attacking the character of the Arabian Prophet the Christian polemic does but weaken his own cause for the saints of old, and New Testament history needs far more apology and defense than the Saints of Islam.

The Koran is admitted by even Sir William Muir to be the most genuine and authentic book on record. Christians have revised and re-revised their Bible, but after a lapse of 1260 years Moslems have precisely the same Koran which was put forth as Mohamed's production only two years after his death. As an historic record it stands unequaled in the history of literature. It took the Christians two centuries to decide the claims of their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inspired book, whereas the Koran is exactly the same as that acknowledged by Moslems only two years after its founder's death. Now, after a lapse of eighteen centuries, Christian doctors reject the "three witnesses" to the divinity of their prophet, whilst Moslems can take into their hand the Arabic Koran without a single doubt as to its being "the Book" which was given to them by their prophet twelve centuries ago.

The Koran has often been ridiculed by Christians. But viewed from either an intellectual or a spiritual standpoint it is truly a wonderful book. The Arabs of the desert regarded it as a message sent down from the very heaven and the advanced Moslem thinker sees in it a remarkable record of the workings of the Prophet's mind as he struggled with the deep things of God, and wrestled with the doubts and cavils of an unbelieving world. It is a consistent book, for although it was addressed to the nomad tribes of Arabia and not to the savans of Leipsic and Boston, it has claimed the devout reverence of the learned Moslem of Baghdad and Cordova in the golden age of Islam, and well has the homage of the wildest and most warlike tribes of the earth.

Christians have ever regarded Islam as immoral, and were a colony of Moslems to establish themselves in America it is very certain that the United States, with all its boasted religious freedom, would not admit them to citizenship. Islam, with its noble traditions of Saracen conquest, is expected to view with favor the puny attempts of American missionaries to convert the Turkish Empire to Christianity and intemperance; but the whole of Europe would rise to arms were Moslems to reciprocate by establishing a Moslem mission in London. The Moslem Khalifah has, by means of political intrigue, been compelled to afford protection to Christian missionaries and even to their quasi converts from Islam, and even to authorize the circulation of the Bible in Turkish dominions, but would the Congress at Washington reciprocate by affording protection to Moslem evangelists in Utah? I have put this question more than once, and I have reeeived the reply "But Islam is immoral."

The Moslem system is held to be immoral on account of its sanction of polygamy! But will Christians quote a single passage in the whole of their Bible prohibiting polygamy? With the help of a Cruden's concordance I have searched the whole book through, and I find that only bishops are restricted to one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wife, an exception which surely proves the rule in early Jewish Christianity. Jesus said: "They twain shall be one flesh," and the Koran saith, "Your Lord created you from one soul." Nay more, the Koran so far from encouraging polygamy gave its express permission to take four wives with the strict proviso, "if you cannot deal justly with so many, then only marry one." And in India and in other parts of the Moslem world there is a growing conviction that polygamy is as much opposed to Koranic legislation as it is to the general progress of civilized society and true culture. But even the great Protestant saint, Luther, allowed Philip of Hesse to take a second wife, and with the whole of the New Testament teaching before him, said: "I confess for my part that if a man wishes to marry two or more wives, I cannot forbid him, nor is his conduct repugnant to Holy Scripture;" while the Holy Father of orthodox Catholic Christianity found no difficulty in arranging for the cruel divorce of the great Napoleon. The system of ethics established by the Koran is pre-eminently practical and cannot be judged by the ascetic standard of Jesus Christ; but it is evident that Mohamed sanctioned polygamy by way of restriction and not of license among a people who observed no nuptial contract. The religious system of Mohamed is declared immoral on account of its supposed unlimited sanction of divorce, a misconception only removed by a careful study of its laws. Moses "suffered" divorce; so did Mohamed. But the Prophet said it was hateful in God's sight although lawful to mankind. So abominable is divorce regarded by respectable Mohamedan families that it is almost unknown among the better classes. It is, in fact, far more common among the Christians of Chicago than among the Moslems of Calcutta. The truth is, no religious system in the world has been able to withstand the vice, and like Moses of old all religious teachers have "suffered it" for the hardness of men's hearts. Islam is said to give divine sanction to slavery. So did the Torah of Moses. Mohamed found domestic slavery existing in Arabia, just as Jesus did in Syria; but whilst the former restrained it by healthful legislation the latter did not interfere with it by either word or deed. Let the word "slave" be substituted for "servant" in the English Bible (as it ought to be), and the Christian reader will be astonished at the result. America freed itself of slavery by the sacrifice of a million lives, but the prophet of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Arabia taught from the very first that he who redeemed a slave from bondage would rescue his own soul from the fires of hell. It cost civilized Christianity a million lives to learn a truth which the Prophet of Arabia taught centuries ago. As a contrast to the hard and cruel spirit of Christian slavery, Mohammed enacted that the bond maid who bore a child to her master secured her emancipation, and no such story as that of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" could have been devised out of Moslem slavery.

The Paradise of Islam has also been regarded as sensual and immoral. Mohamed never intended it to be other than figurative, as figurative as the song of Solomon of Old Testament inspiration, and as the Diwan of Hafiz among Eastern poets. Even Sir William Muir admits that it is remarkable that the notices of this voluptuous paradise are almost entirely confined to a time when the Prophet was living chaste and temperate with a wife of three score years of age. The mystic love of the Eastern devotee has always been typified by the passionate love of earthly relationships, and the absence of such references in the Revelation of Saint John makes it a subject of doubt as to whether that mysterious compilation ever emanated from the pen of a Syrian fisherman. But it is not the object of the present article to undermine the faith of any man in God's inspired record. There is no inspired view of inspiration, and the educated Moslem is as conscious of the difficulties of the subject as the educated Christian; but the necessity of religious belief is forced upon the mind of the Moslem both by historic evidence and by spiritual intuition. The Moslem, more than any other, is more conscious of his need of Divine help, for it is expressed in the initial chapter of the Koran, and recited hundreds of times in his daily liturgy: "Guide us in the right path, oh, God, even in the gracious path of those to whom Thou art merciful."

It is now three years since I stood in pilgrim garb on my way to Mecca, crying with the enthusiasm of the early Moslems "Lubaikah! I stand up for Thy service, O God!" and my contact with anti-Moslem systems has but increased my reverence for the Prophet and the Faith of Islam. I was told the Meccan ceremonies were a remnant of past barbarism. But surely not more so than the ancient rites of the Jewish Temple. Both are of God, and the pilgrims who annually make the Hajj learn in that desert land lessons of light and truth in the same way

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that Israel was taught of God when it pitched its mysterious tabernacle in the wilderness for forty years.

Much more might be written. But, in short, I am a Moslem, "resigned to God's will," because I recognize in Islam one of the many avenues through which the Creator of the Universe leads His people to the Temple of Truth.

ابن عباس

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FUR-SEAL FISHERY DISPUTE.

THE seizure of British vessels in Behring Sea by United States revenue cutters while the former were engaged in the taking of fur seals beyond three marine miles from shore is based, it is claimed by the American Government, on the idea that this part of the sea is wholly within its jurisdiction without regard to such limits, or a *mare clausum* (closed sea), as spoken of in international law. That the acts of one nation which call for the seizure of a number of the vessels of the other should cause widespread comment and discussion in the two countries goes for the saying, whatever be the right or wrong in the case; and that such disputes are strictly one-sided on the two different soils determined by the boundary may nearly always be safely inferred. This unanimity seems somewhat broken among American disputants, however; officials high in rank, who, *ex-officio*, must settle the difficulty, differ seriously as to the settlement, while the pen and press have arraigned themselves on sides for the reasons they set forth. Some writers from purely patriotic reasons, and others in parts of the country that have suffered in the Canadian fishery dispute, have broadly differed from those that claim they see in it only an unpopular and undemocratic protection of a great monopoly, as they choose to style the company the most interested. In short, all the many articles I have seen upon the subject, British or American, and to which my attention has been attracted by the natural interest one takes in a new country where some of his travels and explorations have been cast, have taken one side or the other of the question, and from these premises arrived at their desired conclusions.

It is my object in this article, as far as my limited space and the limited power of my pen will allow, to present all the salient points in a dispute, which, like all others between two great and intelligent nations, has two sides to it. It is not even my intention to draw conclusions from the preponderating testimony

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as I would weigh it, but leave that to my readers to do as they see fit, if they think I have given them all or enough of the *pros* and *cons* with which to do it.

The beginning of the seventeenth century saw international law, long dormant as a seed in the soil of jurisprudence, spring into existence as such under the hands of Hugo Grotius, and the conflicting and desultory writings of Machiavelli, Suarez, Perkins, Ayala, Straccha, Soto, Gentilis, and scores of others were brought into something like harmony with each other, by lopping off conflicting excrescences, and with the equally conflicting shreds of international rules of conduct promulgated in such laws as the *Consolato del Mare*, *Leges Wisbuenses*, the Rhodian Laws, *Lois de Westcapelle*, the *Coutumes d'Amsterdam*, and others, many of which seemed written more with a selfish reference to the armed power of the particular country to enforce them, whether right or wrong, than on any broad principles of human rights. The great work, *de Jure Belli ac Pacis* (1625), by its common-sense concessions, made possible the peace of Westphalia (1648) which ended the fierce and bloody Thirty Years' devastation, by courtesy called a war. Henceforth authorities, trailing in the triumph of this wonderful work, sought rather to find common ground where nations could negotiate a truce in real or threatened war than to give rules how the throne could thumbscrew more blood and booty from a fallen foe. Advancing civilization, weary of war, courted conciliation and concession, rather than conquest, and many pretensions of power were mutually abandoned. Chief among these were those intangible assumptions as to the sovereignty of the seas, to which could be traced so much trouble that could only be cured by more or less complete cancellation of all claims and an ownership in common for purposes of free commerce, the only use to which it could be put after all. Of course the greater extent of the broad oceans was already free long before this—rather from inability to successfully impose their jurisdiction than from lack of inclination on the part of the stronger governments; nor did all nations at once relinquish their assumed sovereignty to watery domain, but rather it was a noticeable turning point from which the previous ebb and flow of such pretensions has steadily decreased on the latter turn of the tide. But "the line had to be drawn somewhere," as no nation would accept high or even low water mark along its shores, nor, in those days when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treachery had not wholly disappeared from the unwritten code of war, allow a ship with closed ports to come too near unquestioned. Then was prominently enforced the maxim of international rule of conduct—as much as international law can be enforced with no higher power than common consent to do so—*Terræ dominium finitur ubi finitur armorum vis*, for all legal lore was Latinized in those "goode olde" days. The meaning of this is simply that as far as the shore could protect itself by arms upon its beach that far no one else would question its jurisdiction. In those days the best of cannon threw their shot *about* three miles, and as all measures on the sea were on the marine scale this was called three marine* miles, or the marine league. This prohibition practically amounted to three miles from a line drawn from cape to cape or headland to headland in sight, as from the deck, or even mast-head, all the windings and the sinuosities of the shore could not be readily made out so as to conform to such an impracticably drawn boundary.

It is upon this three-mile limit that hang all the law and argument of the British side in the Behring Sea controversy; and upon the exceptions as to closed seas that hang all the law and international right of the United States to the contrary, and on the settlement thereof "hang all the law and the profits" of the Alaska Commercial Company, the one most directly interested. In the light of the above assertion it may be proper to briefly review the history of the three-mile limit and the right of certain governments to go beyond that limit.

In Halleck's "International Law" are given special cases where governments may go beyond the boundaries cited. It says: "The maritime territory of every state extends to the ports, harbors, bays, mouths of rivers, and adjacent parts of the sea inclosed by headlands belonging to the same state. Within these limits, its rights of property and territorial jurisdiction are absolute, and exclude those of every other state. The general usage of nations superadds to this extent of territory an exclusive territorial jurisdiction over the sea for the distance of one marine league. . . . . And, even beyond this limit, states may

*Sixty geographical, or marine, or nautical miles (a degree on a meridian) equal sixty-nine and two-tenths statute miles, the miles we usually understand on land. The "knot" or marine mile equals 1.15 miles on land; the marine league equals 3.45 land or "statute" miles.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exercise a qualified jurisdiction for fiscal and defensive purposes; that is, for the execution of their revenue laws, and to prevent 'hovering on their coasts.'" I give this because it is the only one I am able to find which states a general cause or pretext for going beyond the marine league; and as neither reason applies to the captured sealers, and as violent seizure seldom rests on such unstable tenure as qualified jurisdictions, it is evident that we must look to special reasons for the grounds of American action, and such special grounds we find claimed by them, as already stated, in the principle of *mare clausum*, or closed sea, a brief history of which is not uninteresting.

The Republic of Venice once claimed sovereignty over the whole of the Adriatic, and although that power has ceased to exist as such, we do not find her claim maintained at the present day by her successors. England made similar demands upon many of the so-called "narrow seas," but they have been in great part abandoned, though, by right of naval power, she is the dictator of the deep.

A very interesting case is that known as the "Danish Sound Dues," as it seems to have points in common with the Behring Sea dispute, and the United States has taken action on the Danish claim. From time immemorial this little state has set up the demand for a toll through the belts which lead to and from the Baltic Sea, claiming it upon the very antiquity of the tax, which had been ratified by many treaties and conventions with ruling powers, and also on the ground that it was founded in equity, as a fair reimbursement to the Danish crown for expenses in improving the navigation for such through commerce as did not benefit her ports, but she acknowledged that "the law of nations would now hardly seem to sanction the imposition of tolls similar to the sound dues, where none before had existed." The right founded in immemorial usage reaching back to the remotest antiquity is akin and equally as strong as that founded in discovery, and has been less often questioned and overruled, and this (discovery) is the claim of Russia to Behring Sea. Says Halleck: "The United States denied the *right* of Denmark to collect such dues. The dispute was amicably arranged by the convention of February 12th, 1858, the sound and belts being made entirely free to American vessels and their cargoes, the United States paying a fixed sum *en bloc* for light-houses, buoys, etc."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In tracing the three-mile limit parallel to the shores of a country it often happened that these boundary lines bent back and overlapped or touched at converging headlands, although inclosing large watery spaces which were not protected by the rule of a cannon shot hurled a marine league; but if all the shores of such large areas were wholly within the country, it was considered that the area itself fell under the exclusive jurisdiction of the sovereign, although a ship in the centre of it might be out of sight of land, for, having once passed under the authority of a country, and the circumstances being such that it can only seek a port of the same sovereignty, there can be no practical reason why the jurisdiction should have ever ceased for so short a time, while there are many reasons on the part of the safety of the country why it should not cease to hold; and, even shorter than all this, if there were any reasons why the vessel should not continue on into the inclosed waters, the power of the country could be directed to prohibit as soon as it first passed under its jurisdiction, which would be tantamount to unqualified jurisdiction over all. When these areas became so extensive as to be called seas, and single sovereignties thus thrown over them, they were known as closed seas, or *maria clausa*. When conquering nations seized part of the interior shores, this, of course, complicated matters, and history reveals such cases in almost every light from *mare clausum* of the strictest blockade to *mare librum* (free sea) in the broadest sense of the word; and no one rule seems to apply. If the aggressive sovereignty seized one side of the inclosing passage a *mare librum* of necessity existed if the new power demanded it, and even when it did not so seize any part of the outlet the general rule was to open the sea. The case of the Black Sea illustrates these points very well: of it Halleck says in his work on international law: "So long as the shores of the Black Sea were exclusively possessed by Turkey, that sea might, with propriety, be considered as *mare clausum;* and there seemed no reason to question the right of the Ottoman Porte to exclude other nations from navigating the passage which connects it with the Mediterranean, both shores of this passage being also portions of the Turkish territory. But when Turkey lost a part of her possessions bordering upon this sea, and Russia had formed her commercial establishments on the shores of the Euxine, both that empire and other maritime powers became entitled to participate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the commerce of the Black Sea, and consequently to the free navigation of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus. This right was expressly recognized by the Treaty of Adrianople in 1829. But the right of free navigation of the Black Sea, and the consequent right of passage through the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus, was not construed to interfere with the right of *territorial jurisdiction* which the Ottoman Porte exercises over these straits."

Had Russia acquired her title along the Euxine shores by purchase instead of conquest the case would have been nearer to the claim set forth by the United States in Behring Sea, for there might have been still greater variations had Russia so purchased, and united with Turkey to maintain the *status* of *mare clausum*, as we have America and Russia uniting in the question before us. On one side, it is said, in regard to the right of a state to own property and to sell the same, that "it is exclusive of foreign interference, and susceptible of free disposition," and "a sovereign state has the same absolute right to dispose of its territorial or other public property as it has to acquire such property;" and, as we have already seen, national territory consists of water as well as land. "The maritime territory of every state extends to the ports, etc." It seems to follow, therefore, that if Russia had, by any of the known and accepted methods of acquiring exclusive territorial jurisdiction and eminent domain, thrown such rights overBehring Sea, she could transfer them to the United States or other power by sale or other known and accepted methods. "The right of eminent domain is one which, from its very nature, is inseparable from the sovereignty, and is necessarily transferred with the sovereignty."

On the other hand, a very pertinent inquiry is that relating to whether Russian discovery, conquest, or other action gave her a valid claim to such rights over Behring Sea, and whether such claims have been acquiesced in by other nations; for *acquiescence*, after all, is the only true executive department in the international law which governs the republic of nations, there being nothing higher to enforce it. Admitting that Russia was the first civilized power to hold the shores of Behring Sea throughout their whole extent, and that no civilized power had had a previous lodgment thereon, the question as to exclusive jurisdiction, which has been transferred to the United States, rests upon some geographical as well as purely judicial questions. Had the sea

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been an inclosed basin, open at only one channel so narrow as to come within the marine league understanding, as shown in the case of the Black Sea, or similar bodies of water, there would be little doubt as to the *status*, so long as Russia held all the shores, and the bulk of authority seems to be that she could transfer a part of this watery domain; but Behring Sea is not so geographically related to surrounding land and water, for on the north Behring Strait, thirty-six miles wide, leads into the Arctic Ocean, where for something like a half centurya most vigorous commerce has been carried on in the whale fishery by ships of all nations, principally American, however, and which have reached these grounds across the disputed sea without asking leave of any one or having any special treaty rights to do so. On the south side there are innumerable passes through the Aleutian Islands, extending from America to Asia, but none of them, not even Behring Strait, average any larger, or at least much larger, than those which are known to inclose bodies of water over which nations have proclaimed exclusive jurisdiction, to which others have agreed, as between Cape May and Cape Henlopen, for example, the bounding capes of Delaware Bay. But between the Aleutian Islands and the Commander Group off the Kamschatkan coast there is a monstrous gap of water where half the fleet of Russia could sail abreast out of sight of each other and out of sight of land—I have forgotten how many hundred miles across—and through this great ocean way sail many whalers annually who never expect to sight the land. It is by far the largest channel (if not too wide to be called such) which connects a closed sea with the high seas.

For these reasons and some others there has been anything but acquiescence in Russia's claim by nations the most interested, and early in this century one of the strongest protesting powers was the United States. This has been one of the most prominent points urged by popular writers against the American claim of exclusive jurisdiction to-day, but it is also one of the weakest and will not generally hold good in the interpretations of international law. Had the United States pressed her protest to a decision from Russia favorable to her standing on the question at the time, she would more than probably have had to shoulder the disadvantage she had thus enforced on the possessing power when she came in possession herself; but no such conces-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sion was made by the Czar to the American demands, and the United States had a perfect right to insist on the *status* which she found when purchasing, if interpreted to be favorable to her, without regard to the stand taken when it was unfavorable, so long as no treaty or understanding was arrived at which prejudiced such *status*.

There is one point in this connection which I have never seen mentioned, and yet I think it is a very influential one, though probably an indefinite idea which could not well be quoted in cold legal arguments demanding simply facts and figures upon which to base an opinion, yet having a deeper influence in its peculiar province. As the advancing civilization of the world determines the destruction of a policy that is deemed repugnant to that advance, the elimination may be gradual, but usually it is nevertheless so pointedly marked "that he who runs can read"; and there is no extinction that has been more certain and more marked than that of the pretension of powers to their holdings on the seas; and every nation which goes into such a controversy on the side of such pretensions must shoulder this *onus*, by implication at least, however clear the case may be otherwise. In short, we must tread in the tendency of human progress as civilization points its course. Ever since Vasco Nuñez de Balboa waded waist deep into the waters of the greatest sea the world knows and took possession of it in the name of the flag he held in his hand, and even far beyond that date, the whole change of international comity has been to widen the "high" seas, and in no place to contract them. Whatever may be the outcome of this controversy the day is not distant, as history reckons days, when the strict three-mile limit may be all that is left of maritime domain, and even that may be invaded in part, and should our own Government concede this point of the inevitable, now or next day, it will be but placing another pointing post on a well marked road whose end is on the sands of a shore washed by the waves of *mare librum*.

The catching of a fur seal, or other valuable animal or fish, or even herds of them, is but a mere thread in a fabric whose warp and woof are made up of such international subjects as those of debatable closed seas and seizures thereon. On the former, we have given some rambling points, and a brief discussion of the latter would be pertinent to the general subject in hand.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American authority says: "Before taking such forcible possession (meaning seizure of another nation's persons or property), it is necessary for us to prove clearly our right to the thing in dispute, and also that we have already tried the milder modes of adjustment, for other people are not obliged to respect that title any further than we show its validity, nor will they justify us in resorting to a measure of so much rigor, and one, too, so likely to produce the most serious consequences to society, until we justify our conduct on the ground of its absolute necessity. The possessor may, therefore, remain in the possession till proof is adduced to convince him that his possession is unjust."

While our protest against Russia's claim of similar import is hardly pertinent to be used against us as to settlement, it seems to have a bearing on the interpretation of whether or not we can "prove clearly our right to the thing in dispute," and therefore justify our sequestration of British property on debatable water. We can hardly claim a course to be clear when we can find enough to protest against it, though no propriety is shocked by assuming it was not enough to settle it, as we then wanted, after we had purchased the difficulty along with the domain. This is certainly so, if we must give any weight to the same authority that "the seizure of the thing in controversy is generally regarded as the preliminary step toward the commencement of a war." It may be said that the offending power, Great Britain, has used the same questionable means in another controversy, which is admitted; but so long as our seizures are not based on reprisal, the other offense does not enter into the discussion any more than any other two distinct questions; and the Behring Sea captures are distinctly reported not to be reprisals.

When matters involving such unquestionable outrages as those perpetrated by the vessel "Alabama" can be settled by the peaceful methods of arbitration, it may well be questioned whether we have "tried the milder modes of adjustment" in taking a course which borders so closely on the "bloody boundaries of war."

The national questions at issue have been so widely discussed that nothing can be added; suffice to say that in the American diversity of opinion is seen a fairer appreciation of the case than on the other side; and leaving out such partisan questions as to the rapidity of the Government to seize in defense of a great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

monopoly on one ocean, and thus invite war, and the slowness to defend the rights of the humbler people on the other side, where war is justifiable, it appears that the American Government seems more willing to settle its aggression on broad and unselfish grounds than does the opposing sovereignty in some of its pretensions.

FREDERICK SCHWATKA.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BURNING OF COLUMBIA.

[General Sherman, in response to suggestions that he should take some notice of recent utterances of Gen. Wade Hampton in the United States Senate, declines any controversy with Gen. Wade Hampton or any body else, about the origin of the fire which destroyed the heart of Columbia, S. C., during the night of February 17, 1865.

The case has been authoritatively concluded by the judgment of the mixed Commission on American and British Claims under the treaty with Great Britain, composed of Count Corti, of Italy; Honorable Russell Gurney, M. P., of London, and Honorable Jas. I. Fraser, of Indiana, in favor of the United States.

All the testimony is published in the cases Wood and Heyworth vs. United States, and of Cowlam Graveley vs. United States, copies of which can doubtless be had on application to the State Department at Washington.

General Sherman, in his testimony therein fully reported, under cross-examination, explained why Wade Hampton felt so restless under the strictures that were made upon his defense of his home and fireside, after having defied the invaders.

General Sherman states that if General Wade Hampton seeks a controversy, he can have it by addressing Capt. A. E. Wood, 4th U. S. Cavalry, at Fort Huachuca, Arizona, a copy of whose recent letter here follows.—ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.]

FORT HUACHUCA, ARIZONA,
February 13, 1888.

GENERAL W. T. SHERMAN:

SIR: I notice by the late papers that General Wade Hampton is out in another tirade against you, wherein he accuses you of burning Columbia, S. C.

For the past twenty years I have noticed these periodical attacks, but I have never written you, giving my positive knowledge of the facts in the case, for the reason that ever since 1868 I have either been a cadet at the military academy or an officer in the regular army; and as you have been in command of the army until within the last few years, a letter to you, under the circumstances would seem like currying favor, a thing which my most intimate friends can never accuse me of doing. But now, since you have nothing to do with the active army, I can write you

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with that fullness of friendship which active warfare begets between the soldier and his successful commander.

During the war I belonged to the 3d Brigade, 4th Division, 17th Army Corps. This brigade consisted of four Iowa regiments, viz.: 11th, 13th, 15th and 16th Regiments. I belonged to Co. "F" 13th Iowa.

The Saluda and Broad rivers form a junction a very little above the City of Columbia, S. C., and the main stream is called the Congaree. Logan was laying the pontoons across the two rivers above mentioned when the brigade to which I belonged arrived at the banks of the Congaree, opposite the city. The State House was on the ridge, probably three-quarters of a mile and a little down the stream from us. From the top of this ridge, where the State House was located, to the water's edge, the ground sloped more abruptly at first, then more gently, until within a quarter of a mile of the river, where the slope was scarcely perceptible, making what we usually term a "flat." On the edge of this "flat," farthest from the river, and below us, the railroad depot was located. We were about west of the city, and could see everything to the top of the ridge.

The depot was burning when we came in sight, and long before a "Yankee" soldier could get across the river. General Belknap commanded the division, but he sent word to our brigade asking for volunteers to cross the Congaree in boats if we could find them. Everybody volunteered, and we commenced hunting for boats. The regiment finding the first good boat was to have the honor of crossing first. The Fifteenth Iowa men found a flat-boat first, but it went under water when the men commenced filing in. My regiment found a good flat-boat which carried about twenty-five men at a trip. I was in the first boatload. We landed a short distance below an old mill which was occupied by some of Hampton's cavalry. Of course they vacated very quickly and left us in possession. When about seventy-five men of my regiment had crossed, Lieutenant-Colonel J. C. Kennedy deployed us as skirmishers, and we started straight for the State House. Logan was still laying his pontoons. After firing a very few shots at Hampton's men, after we got in the city, we reached the State House and planted our colors. Logan received the Mayor's surrender at the other end of the city at least two hours after we put our colors on the State House.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I am thus particular, because I wish to show that we were the first "Yankee" soldiers in Columbia, and consequently we can tell something about the fire. Most of the city was built along the ridge and to the east of it. There were streets laid out and residence houses constructed on the slope towards the river, but few if any of them continued to the "flat." The skirmish line kept in very good shape until we reached the city, where we broke up into parties and traversed the streets, the State House always being the objective point. I was with a squad of men who went up a street which ran parallel to the one leading to the State House, and probably two or three blocks from it. As soon we reached the top of the ridge we took a cross street which went directly towards the State House, and I saw our flag raised about the time I reached the top of the ridge. In going up this street towards the top of the ridge we passed a long pile of baled cotton, and this was on fire in two or three places when we reached it. None but Hampton's men or the citizens of the place could have set fire to this cotton. The cotton was piled probably three bales high, a little nearer the north side of the street than the middle, in order to leave a roadway. As to how long the pile of cotton was I now can give no estimate, but the impression left on my boyish mind was that it was immense. The wind was blowing not a hurriance but a very stiff gale from the west, although the sky was perfectly clear. My service in Texas, New Mexico, Indian Territory, Kansas and Nebraska since then has made me more familiar with severe winds than I was at that time, and still by comparison I must call it a *very* heavy wind storm. I thought while passing this cotton that the severe wind would certainly drive the fire into some of those houses, and it did so, for this was the first part of the city that took fire. The fire did not get into the main part of the city until about dark, and did not reach the State House until about one o'clock A.M. In the meantime, I, with many others, tried our best to stop the conflagration and help the women and children rescue the few household effects that it was possible to get out of the burning houses.

The arms of my regiment were stacked in the State House yard, and until the house took fire I was continually in the close proximity of the fire, rendering such assistance as I could to the inhabitants, and during all this time I did not see a single act of vandalism by any of our men. We had no sentiment of kindness

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the people of Columbia, because it was the capital of the state which did the most to bring on the war; but our feelings of humanity did not allow us to be indifferent spectators of the sufferings of the women and children, much less to aggravate those sufferings by acts of barbarism. I distinctly remember that it was the general talk among the men that the city took fire from the burning cotton, and we all knew that Wade Hampton's men set fire to the cotton. After the fire got started it propagated itself. I saw flaming shingles carried over a hundred yards by the wind. It was in this manner that the fire, to use a Western phrase, "jumped the streets" without hindrance. When the old State House took fire it burned like tinder, and the heat from it was intense, destroying many dressed stones that were lying in the yard prepared for the new State House, which was in course of construction at the time.

Columbia was of no importance to us; it was only a halting place for the night. Johnston's army was our objective, and we reached it in a few days. Wade Hampton knows as surely as he is a living man that his command set fire to that cotton, and indirectly burned down the city of Columbia, and his reiterations of innocence convince me not only of his consciousness of guilt but also of a personal motive, be that what it may.

I will say one word about what was known as "Sherman's Bummers." From what has been said upon the subject I infer that those who never saw the army under your command have an idea that "Sherman's Bummers" were a class of men who revered nothing, destroyed everything, and were barbarous in the extreme. This idea has probably been somewhat strengthened by the veteran himself, as he narrates his exploits while sitting, with his children around him, in front of a pleasant fireplace, during the long winter evenings. The circumstances of age, length of time, distance from the scene of action and frequent repetition, are all calculated to give wings to the imagination, and what was once a truth is now a hyperbole. The Bummer proper, the man that was known as such at the time, was perfectly brave, of fine practical intelligence, a man full of resource, and whose affections were bound up in the company to which he belonged. "Sherman's Bummers" were men detailed—two from each company of infantry—for the purpose of securing food for their comrades and forage for the animals. Every morning the company details reported to regimental

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

headquarters, and from there they reported to brigade headquarters, etc. Each brigade organization was ordered to scout a certain area of country for food and forage, bringing the fruit of their labors to a certain place, which was always to be the camp for the coming night. They mounted themselves as best they could; they found grist mills and set them to grinding; they took such wagons, carts or buggies, horses, mules, oxen or donkeys as they could find, to the camps. It was a life of unceasing toil and danger. The enemy's cavalry was in the country, and the men often had to fight for what they got. They were ordered, upon hearing the report of a musket or cannon, to go for the place as fast as they could travel. Often, when the enemy attacked two or three men, in the course of twenty minutes one would have a hundred dare devils after him. As a rule, a brave man is not cruel. These men committed no atrocities. They took what the necessities of the case and the rules of war allowed them. From a humanitarian standpoint war is cruel, it cannot be otherwise; but the cruelties of our Civil War were far less in number and smaller in degree than those of any other war during the century preceding it.

"Sherman's Bummers" did not set fire to Columbia, for the river prevented their passage, and knowing that we should get possession of the town in a few hours, they joined their respective companies before any of the troops passed over, and remained with them until the next day.

I authorize you to use this letter as you may think best.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

A. E. Wood,
Captain Fourth Cavalry.

Certified a true copy.

W. T. Sherman, General.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GILBERT'S FABLES.

WANT of sympathy between men of like high character or noble pursuits is not uncommon. Hence it need not perplex us to find Bacon accusing Dr. Gilbert, a fellow countryman and author of "De Magnete," in 1600, of telling "so many fables" in that remarkable first treatise on magnetism. But though his work was thus belittled where it should have received the warmest recognition, Gilbert to-day is universally admitted to have made the new departure from which all electrical chronology dates. He was not only, as Hallam says, the writer of the first notable English work in physics, but the father of experimental philosophy in England; and his airy "fables" have resolved themselves into some of the most solid benefits that science has conferred on mankind. Could Bacon see what has been accomplished through the development of Gilbert's fancies and theories, it would surprise him perhaps not less than to behold himself credited with the plays of Shakespeare.

The results of electrical discovery are, in fact, already so numerous that in dealing with the subject it becomes more and more difficult for the reviewer of growth in this field to do other than generalize. At the International Electrical Exhibition in Philadelphia in 1884 the production and application of electricity required division into no fewer than fifty classes. A few months ago, at the fair of the American Institute, in New York, the use of electricity as a motive power alone found as many special departments; while several inventions embryonic or unknown three years back, were well to the front as objects of curiosity or investigation. Less than almost any other men are electricians inclined to accept Lord John Russell's invitation to "rest and be thankful," or to loaf and invite their souls with Walt Whitman. Never, indeed, has there been in electrical work greater activity than that which has prevailed during the last twelve months, and never before were such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

extensive plans in contemplation. It is this very onrush and uplift of inventive genius and practical development that tempts to dithyrambic raptures alike the social reformer who sees in electricity a panacea for every ill, and the speculator who notes with quick eye the new chance offered to play on old credulity. The modern world is altogether of the opinion of Justin McCarthy's utilitarian baronet that "practical science is the great thing," and it is well aware that electric arts are first among those which now secure and enlarge human welfare, as well as promise benefits in the ages yet to run.

Each of the great departments of electrical application has its own interesting story or pertinent moral, and each is a typical exemplification of the rapidity with which, in America, the visionary idea of one hour becomes the prosaic reality of the next. The telegraph was the first of the great electrical successes, and is an old friend of the present generation. Its ten-word tariff has introduced into popular and business phraseology a terseness the furthest removed from grammar and elegance. It is a prime agent in stockjobbing operations and the ready ally of the detective bureau. It is the mainstay of the daily press, whose columns it half fills. Its wires have long been among the strongest ligatures that can unite a nation so widely distributed from sea to sea as ours. It has profoundly affected international relations, provoking from Prince Bismarck the odd complaint that diplomacy has, therefore, ceased to be unctuous. Fit expression, as it is, of this fussy, alert, inquisitive and intense age, it has become hackneyed and commonplace. Yet it has been in use a bare fifty years, for it was only in January, 1838, that Professor Morse completed his rough operative model of the recording electro-magnetic telegraph, and exhibited it in this city.

Early associates of Morse are still living who helped him string his primitive land lines, while Mr. Cyrus Field recalls easily, across a scant quarter of a century, the vivid memories of the failure of the first cables, when hope and funds were both exhausted, and Dr. Holmes apostrophised in caustic verse the mythical De Sauty, who insisted throughout that everything was "all right" when there was a well-founded suspicion that something was very decidedly wrong. At the present time a dozen cables span the Atlantic between Europe and America. In 1886 there were six hundred and sixty-seven thousand seven hundred and ten miles of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

telegraph wire in the United States, which carried seventy-two million messages; and the aggregate of work done in analogous services, such as police, fire, burglar alarm, stock ticker and district messenger, would show results as large. These figures are in themselves an indication that the interest of the public in the telegraph is now commercial rather than scientific. It is true that progress has recently been made in sextuplexing, and in telegraphy between moving trains, and that telegraphy between ships at sea, through the water, is in the near future; but, after all, the telegraph is, in the sphere of electricity, and compared with later advances, very much like England or Portugal compared with our new Western States. In the one case it is a question of economy, of higher output, of making the most of one's familiar resources; in the other, it is a question of exploitation, of frontier enterprise and of the pre-emption and occupancy of virgin soil. The telegraphic struggles and agitations that arrest public attention belong to Wall street, for those that once occupied the schools and the patent courts have almost all been disposed of. In one direction, however, the telegraph will sooner or later attract notice, and that is as a leading political issue. It has always been somewhat singular that the newspapers most desirous of governmental control of the telegraph should be eager in welcome of any new contestant with the Western Union Company, whether it be Mr. Garrett executing ancestral schemes, or Mr. Mackay backed by mines of silver. Five years of uninterrupted monopoly by the great corporation whose appetite for rivals has grown by what it feeds upon, might settle the controversy for ever.

The telephone, though a great and distinct invention, came in an evolutionary way. The use of the telegraph had not only created the want but had pointed to the means of supplying it, and when the crude instrument was brought out, its value was immediately recognized in technical circles, in spite of the remark of one cultured organ of public opinion in New York that there was no field of usefulness for it. Within a decade, however, it has become the most patronized means of urban intercommunication, and its "extra-territorial" or long-distance lines are paralleling telegraph circuits in every direction. Last year no fewer than 312,605,710 exchange "connections" were made, and nearly 3,000,000 messages passed over extra-territorial wires. The exchange work is growing at the rate of 25,000,000 conversations

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

per annum, and it is now nothing unusual to bring together the wires of five or six thousand subscribers in a single switch-board. Protected by exclusive patents, which remain in force after tremendous litigation and unscrupulous onslaught by politicians, the telephone industry constitutes a strong and ramified monopoly in which the parent company and its sub-organizations are partners. Should the fundamental patents be broken before their normal expiration, there would begin a desperate fight for the prize of exchange business, but it seems likely that this would rest in the hands now holding it. The management of the telephone system, as a whole, has been carried on with consummate skill, and as the nature of the service requires that in any given city the customers shall all be within reach of each other, it is natural that the capital stock and investment of over $50,000,000 should be able to maintain against all competition the 1,182 exchanges and branches now in operation. This is as it may be, and is a consideration for those advocating a national telegraph system. It would be useless to buy up or control that without securing the telephone. Perhaps both will remain private property, but be placed under the supervision of a body similar to the Railway Commission now enforcing the provisions of the Interstate Commerce law. Outside of the exchange system, however, a great field of employment will some day be found for the telephone in supplementing or even supplanting the present annunciator system in hotels, factories and offices; and in domestic life it will replace the ineffectual bell.

It is not impertinent to point here to the striking contrast between the development of the telephone in America and in Europe. There are in America 147,000 exchange subscribers, and the instruments in use number 353,518. Returns made lately show that in Holland, Belgium, Italy and Russia there are only 19,000 telephone subscribers. Thus in America with a population of 60,000,000, the proportion is one in 340; in the large section of Europe above named, with a population of 136,000,000, it is one in every 7,158. New York and Brooklyn have as many telephones as all Italy; Chicago is on an equality with Russia; Boston is abreast of Holland. If use of the telephone be taken, instead of the familiar standards, as a test of civilization, America is so far ahead as to place Europe in the ranks of barbarism. The explanation is hard to determine. In Europe the telephone is controlled

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the various governments, and that may be one reason, though it is not an argument that will commend itself in all quarters.

Scarcely had the telephone been accepted as a boon, before the rays of the first practical commercial electric light were perceived. Previous to 1879, the public knew of electric lamps only by name, and with that year begins the present period of electrical engineering which will be a notable and marked feature of the last part of the nineteenth century. Up to that time, save in electro-plating, large currents were beyond the skill of the electrician, either to produce or to handle for general consumption. Now, every night, scores of huge central stations throw on their wires currents representing as much as 1,500 horse-power, as well as illustrating on a gigantic scale the correlation of forces and the conservation of energy. Beginning its career amid wild and disastrous speculation, the electric light has survived the reckless booming of its most enthusiastic friends and the violent opposition of its most savage enemies. The capital invested in the United States in the manufacture of electric lighting apparatus and the sale of electric light locally is already equal to that in telegraphy and telephony together, reaching over $150,000,000. A thousand lighting companies and three thousand private plants have in operation 200,000 arc lights and nearly 1,500,000 incandescents, and the work is only in its inception. In New York alone three new stations each of 2,000 horse-power are contracted for or in course of construction, and the designs have been made for as many more. Noteworthy, too, is the change of front on the part of the gas companies, over a hundred of which have come to the conclusion that they can sell silk as well as calico, and have equipped to fill the demand for the new style of goods.

The reasons for the popularity of the electric light are not far to seek. On the public streets and in open areas, the arc light has proved a convenience to good citizens and a terror to evil doers. Few more cheerful or beautiful sights can be seen than the tower, like a radiant "sister of the day," as Shelley phrased it, holding aloft through storm and calm its torch of living fire, or the long lines of insistent white stars that now begirdle the thoroughfares of our most progressive cities. The production of arc lights has been so greatly improved and cheapened that their use is now universal. Mayor Hewitt has proposed their adoption in New

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

York for all the streets, on the ground that they "tend very greatly to the prevention of crime and the preservation of good order in the city;" and exclusive lighting of the streets in this way is now under practical consideration also in Chicago and Philadelphia. The future of the arc light is well assured.

The incandescent electric light, the little bulb in which the resistance offered to the passage of the current causes the carbon filament to glow brightly in the vacuum, is now being introduced at a remarkable rate. Its vogue may be accounted for on a variety of grounds. The following table is one of them:

Illuminant.	Cubic feet of oxygen consumed.	Cubic feet of air consumed.	Cubic feet of air vitiated.	Cubic feet of carbonic acid produced.	Heat produced in one pound of water raised 1° F.
12 candle power of gas	5.45	17.25	345.25	3.21	278 6
12 " " " oil	6.81	34.05	484.05	4.50	361.9
12 " " " tallow candle	12 00	60.00	933.00	8.73	505.5
12 " " " electric incandescent lamp	None.	None.	None.	None.	13.5

The insurance companies have marked their appreciation by lowering premiums wherever this light is used, and the decorators of the modern House Beautiful have hastened to save their productions by employing it, and to develop its æsthetic possibilities. In his charming little work on "The Library," Mr. Andrew Lang, by way of earnest advice, says: "The book collector must avoid gas, which deposits a filthy coat of oil that catches dust;" and it is well known that many libraries are now open at night with the help of electric light that formerly were accessible only in the daytime. One can hardly enter a fine new building anywhere without observing the incandescent lamp or the little wires that betoken its coming. The only objection to this light—its cost—grows fainter every year. In a large number of places it is sold at a profit in direct competition with the cheapest gas, and the wholesale way in which it is now supplied also tends to equalize the economic conditions. One effect of its introduction, as exemplified by figures gathered from a score of towns and cities in eight States, is a reduction of 26 per cent. in the price of gas to the con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sumer. Moreover, the percentage of candle-power to horse-power is steadily gaining, and is far from its ultimate limits. Electrical ingenuity is just at present striving chiefly to simplify and cheapen the methods of distributing the current to the lamps, and notable results have been gained. That the change from gas to electricity is going on cannot be denied, but the significance of the revolution is not generally understood. Take merely its relation to mechanical engineering. Expert figures on incandescent lighting show that a central station plant at full capacity should be equal to one 16 candle-power lamp per capita of population. Five years hence 18,000,000 people will be living in cities and towns of 4,000 and upward. To supply them would require an output of 11,000 lamps, and of 1,000 horse-power of boilers, engines and dynamo-electric machines every working day from now until 1892. The gain in 1887 justifies the sober acceptance of such calculations as not far from the mark.

If the utility of the distribution of electric current were arrested at this point, it would not be quite so difficult to estimate its possibilities, but already it is evident that lighting is but one department to be considered. Many minor employments for the current from lighting circuits have already been found, including the boiling of kettles and the heating of foot warmers, where the kettle and the warmer are simply substituted for the lamp. But all such work sinks into utter insignificance when compared with that which has opened up in the use of electricity as a motive power. The central station superintendent can now assert, in the language of James Watt to King George : " I have what all your Majesty's subjects want—power." The citizen who turns on the water tap or lights his gas realizes that he is drawing on a reservoir practically inexhaustible, but he has not yet mastered the idea that the wires running by his door bring to his service an unwearying agent that, in readiness and variety of accomplishment, is a veritable Jack-of-all-trades, whose ability rises in exact proportion to the demands made for performance. The electric motor as an efficient machine has not been known much more than two years, but the rapidity of its introduction has been nothing short of marvelous. The first American statistics on the subject, collected recently by the writer, show that there are now in use in this country at least ten thousand electric motors, and that at the present rate of demand the number will be doubled within six

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

months. One type of motor alone is now employed in over one hundred and twenty different industries. The work given these machines, a large number of which are from one up to fifteen horse-power, and are driven by current from a central station which at night feeds hundreds of electric lights on the same wires, is not a little striking and amusing. One in a livery stable operates an elevator, pumps water and brushes down the horses. Another is used to squirt colors on photographs. A third is driving a large factory where scores of its fac-similes are made daily. Over a dozen are already on the presses of daily papers. One operates the machinery of a knitting mill where two hundred and fifty hands are employed. Hundreds are at work in connection with fans, sewing machines, coffee mills, ice cream freezers, church organs, boatblacking brushes, freight and passenger elevators, dental lathes, jewelers' tools and the like. Curious instances of the repeated conversion of current into mechanical energy and back again are to be found in the use of motors to drive electro-plating machines, or the dynamos which now, instead of chemical batteries, furnish current in large telegraph offices.

In a word, the electric motor has won its place and laid hold on the future. It has begun a tremendous revolution in the mechanical world. It has distanced other small motors, including the steam engine. A leading mechanical engineer has frankly avowed his opinion that up to fifteen horse-power the electric motor must have the preference over other power apparatus, and his views are more than confirmed by the willingness of power users to pay three and four times the price for the electric motor that they give for the small steam engine. With the electric motor no coal has to be brought in or dirt carried away. No water supply is needed. The engineer is dispensed with. No heat is created. Insurance is lowered. Space is economized. The motor that drives the presses of a daily paper in Detroit has been standing and working on the case it was shipped in. The wires that carry the current may pass through the keyhole, down the chimney, or in by the window frame. In the morning the turn of a switch puts the motor in operation, and at night, with another turn, it ceases to work so quickly that a minute later no one could tell it had been running. The tendency, moreover, is toward the use of larger motors, even above twenty-five horse-power. The average charge per horse-power throughout the country is about $100 per annum, and on this basis,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

motors of any size, deriving current from central stations, compete easily with any other kind of appliance. Recent investigations go to prove also that in the distribution of water powers, the electric motor is unsurpassed ; that even in large mills it may be more economical to convert the water power into electric current in the basement, for driving motors on the various floors, than to connect the turbine directly with long lines of heavy shafting in the usual way. With electric motors the town or mine or factory to be furnished with power may be miles above the plant that generates the current, literally causing the water to do work by returning upward to its source.

Need we wonder that this matter promises to engross the thoughts of the physicist, the mechanic, and the social philosopher ? At the meeting of the National Electric Light Association in Boston last August, the mayor of that city expressed the belief that the electric motor would enable the people there to build up a great many small industries that had been neglected. The same impression is entertained in other cities by many who see that owing to the great flexibility of the system and its easy subdivision of power, it is no longer necessary to concentrate skilled producers within a small and costly space. August Bibel, the German socialist, in his work on "Woman," goes even further, and asserts that electric power is to take the first place in wiping out the "bourgeois world," clearing the road for the socialized community, and "contributing enormously to the amelioration of human conditions of existence." The motor will certainly tend to lighten labor. It is likely to assist by its handiness for domestic purposes, in settling the vexed "servant girl question." But it seems probable that the struggle which is naturally arising for the control in each place of this service, will do much to lessen the blessings counted by the optimist as within reach of the toilers.

There is yet another sphere for the electric motor to fill: that of street railway propulsion. The electric railway is still a novelty, but in the United States and Canada to-day twenty-two such roads are in operation carrying passengers at the rate of between five and ten millions annually ; fifteen are in course of construction ; contracts have been made for nearly twenty more, and many are projected. One of the roads building will have forty electric cars. This all means that the street railway is being revo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lutionized by electricity as much as are industries requiring stationary motors. Animal power is far too costly in comparison with either the cable system or the electric system, between which the competition for urban traffic now lies. Out of the 120,000 horses on street car lines, 20,000 become practically useless every year. The huge stables are far too often an eyesore and a nuisance. The plant generating current for the motors on the line can be paid for out of the economy on real estate, and in every instance of test, electricity has been demonstrated to be cheaper than animal power by from thirty to fifty per cent. With electricity, there is a remarkable range of choice as to method. The motor can be placed anywhere on the car, and the current for it is conveyed by overhead wires, by a conduit, by one of the ordinary rails, or is derivable from storage batteries under the seats. The conduit and the storage battery methods will prevail for large cities, and for both an economy averaging from ten to twenty per cent. over the cable is claimed. Time will, it is believed, justify electricians in their estimates. Meanwhile an electric railway has been established in highly successful operation in a large Boston sugar refinery, and one in a Pennsylvania coal mine. Steam, though becoming more and more objectionable for motive purposes in cities, may, however, enjoy a monopoly on the large railroads indefinitely. The operation of the New York Central Railroad by electricity is a task which no man feels called upon to grapple with at present.

In many ways, nevertheless, electricity is gaining a foothold on the steam railroad. Its use in train dispatching and signaling is an old story, but it has also recently been adopted very extensively for train lighting, and the resort for this service is again made to storage batteries. This year will be memorable in American electrical annals for the renewed attention paid to storage. The batteries now furnished return eighty per cent. of the current with which they have been charged, and though they have still to undergo radical improvements, they are already engaged in much practical work. The manner in which they assist in the utilization of "waste powers" stamps them as among the most noteworthy innovations of this era.

It has long been a devout wish of the electrical investigator or inventor to hit upon some method of obtaining electricity direct from fuel. This question may not seem to be as much within the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

range of "practical politics" as that of putting the wires underground, but it is more fascinating to the electrical mind, and the endeavors to settle it are unceasing. Public attention has just been drawn to one invention in which the alternate heating and cooling of magnetic metal in front of a magnet causes rotation and produces a current; and the eagerness with which several inventors have come forward to claim priority betrays the general interest in the subject. Similar efforts are also being made to produce current directly from fuel, in this way, with a battery, and one of the latest devices is a cell in which coal is used as the positive electrode. Early advances along this line of research are to be looked for. A number of earnest men, who, for passionate love of experiment may be classed with Faraday, are devoting themselves to the study. The selenium cell, turning sunshine into current; the pyromagnetic generator, like its forerunner, the thermopile, converting heat into electricity, and the cell in which coal is actually consumed—are the first fruits of their quest.

And so one might go on. As Dr. Priestley reflected a hundred years ago: "It may be said that there is a *ne plus ultra* in everything, and therefore in electricity. It is true, but what reason is there to think that we have arrived at it?" To-day we can only echo Priestley's words. What has been achieved tells us that the greater lies before. The electrician proposes to himself the navigation of the ambient air and the exploration of the deepest sea. He is hastening the time when hand-written correspondence between persons hundreds of miles apart will no longer depend on slow mails; and when seeing by electricity, as much as speaking by it, will be a matter of every day experience. His skill is simplifying the arts of peace and complicating the artifices of warfare. He has found new cures for physical ailments, and his magnet even gives relief, it is said, to minds diseased. Thus, a foremost exponent of modern science, he is ever presenting to the world new problems in chemistry, mechanics, politics, and ethics, and is himself reaching their solution.

THOMAS COMMERFORD MARTIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POSSIBLE PRESIDENTS.

GENERAL WILLIAM TECUMSEH SHERMAN.

In considering Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman as a possible President we are met at the outset by a difficulty. He has not only refused to be a candidate, but has intimated that if the convention nominates him "it will hear something unpleasant," and the grim old warrior is notoriously in the habit of keeping his word. Nevertheless, the acceptance of high office becomes sometimes a duty, and none the less a duty because distasteful. It is possible to conceive a condition of affairs in the country which would make the call upon the General so urgent that he could not refuse the nomination without a palpable shirking of responsibility; and this he would never do, for it is foreign to his nature. While such a possibility exists, Gen. Sherman must necessarily be counted in the list of possible Presidents; and, indeed, that list would be left with a large gap in it if there were omitted the striking figure of one who has contributed so much to making American history. We have to consider him as a man, not of words and opinions, but of deeds; and from what his life has been, infer what he would be if called upon to occupy the Presidential chair. Certainly of all our eminent men, none would present a more interesting figure as President than the old soldier, now in his sixty-eighth year, but vigorous, plain-spoken and original as ever.

In those great scenes wherein each first commanded the attention of the world, the personality of Grant stands out powerful, silent, immobile; but in another orbit the fiery Sherman moves, his path a swift destruction. The destroyer has his place in the complex life of man no less necessary than the constructor, for the destruction of the old clears the ground for the sounder building of the new. It has been so with this nation. No issue thoroughly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tried in battle is ever appealed to another tribunal. Four years of war laid forever at rest the distracting controversies of forty years of peace, but none of the men who had been leaders in these controversies bore a prominent part in settling them where they were settled, on the battle field. That work was done by men previously obscure or unknown, and one of these was Sherman. His work was to destroy, and he crosses the eventful pages of that history the embodied genius of destruction, brilliant and desolating.

We see the pictures of him as he appeared then. Tall of stature, broad chested and well knit, but spare of flesh because of intense nervous energy; restless and quick in movement; his eye large, eager and piercing; with hawk-like nose, and iron-clamped jaw stiffly bearded; a broad expanse of forehead, so broad as to be out of proportion to the rest of the face; and the stern look, stern almost to grimness. It is a thoroughly Yankee cast of countenance, for his mother was a Hoyt of New England; and strong, instinct with energy, and dauntless. He looked all the soldier, and as a soldier he had been trained from early youth. At twenty he graduated from West Point, sixth in his class; but while from 1840 to 1853 he was in the military service, unlike Grant, he did not serve in the Mexican war. He was stationed in California during that period. It was all peaceful there, and he had no opportunity to distinguish himself. But one little occurrence gave a taste of his quality. One Nash had set himself up by virtue of a local election, in opposition to the regularly appointed magistrate of Sonoma. There was a good deal of fuss over the matter, and Lieutenant Sherman was sent up by his superior officer to settle it. This he did in the simplest way by seizing Nash at supper, bundling him into a cart and carrying him off to Monterey. The manner of the arrest recalls the historic incident of Cornet Joyce and his authority of a file of soldiers. Says the General in his "Memoirs":

> "I walked up to him and took his arm, and told him to come with me. Green (a lawyer) put himself between me and the door, and demanded in theatrical style why I dared arrest a peaceable citizen in his house. I simply pointed to my pistol and told him to get out of the way, which he did."

Having attained the rank of captain, Sherman resigned from the army in 1853, and was engaged as a banker in San Francisco through the exciting times of the Vigilance Committee, whose

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doings he does not approve; and when the great commercial crash came later, his banking house was the one that stood the shock alone, because his keen prevision of coming disaster had impelled him to take the necessary precautions to meet it. But the crash killed business. He left for the East and went into business in Wall street just in time to meet the disastrous financial collapse started by the failure of the Ohio Loan and Trust Company, which broke up his firm. A partnership in a law firm in the West, from which he could not make enough to support his growing family, was a passing step to the more congenial occupation of superintendent of the then recently established Louisiana Military Academy. He had barely put this into good working shape when the war broke out, and refusing tempting offers to remain, he resigned to come North. This was the early part of 1861.

It would be expected that he, a trained soldier, would have sought service in the army at once, but he did not. He saw the South everywhere preparing actively for war, and coming north saw a supineness which amazed and disgusted him. He was introduced by his brother, Senator Sherman, to Lincoln; and the latter's indifferent reply to his statement that the South was ready for war, "Oh, I guess we'll manage to keep house," silenced him. He went back to St. Louis to take the presidency of a street railroad company, swearing in good round style that the politicians having brought on the war might fight it out themselves. But this was not to be. The brother of a United States Senator who talked in that style was open to the suspicion of disloyalty. Captain Sherman heard rumors that he was "unsound." They seem to have touched him, for he then wrote offering his services, adding that the army list would show the rank he expected. In June, 1861, he was commissioned Colonel of the Thirteenth United States Infantry. From that dates his part in the grand drama of the Civil War, and its beginning was most inauspicious.

This man who was trained from boyhood to a soldier's life, who was destined soon to give the world new ideas in the science of war, who became the conceded master of the use of the "flying column," who led his army to the most brilliant successes and received the surrender of the last army the enemy had in the field, never saw a shot fired in anger till he was forty-one, and his first battle was the humiliating rout of Bull Run. There he com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manded a brigade, but a few weeks after was transferred to Kentucky. A month later he had succeeded to the command of the department as brigadier-general of volunteers. Here it was that he was visited by the astute Pennsylvania wire-puller, Simon Cameron, who, in the distribution of cabinet offices, had received the Department of War. Of anything but political warfare, the battle of caucus and convention, Mr. Cameron had not only no knowledge, but he had no conception. His mind seems to have been unable to grasp the idea of war. It presented itself to him as of the nature of a riotous disturbance, to be suppressed by an adequate force of police or the militia. It is not surprising, therefore, as we look back upon those times, that the ill-placed secretary should have been thunderstruck when the general in command of the comparatively minor department of Kentucky informed him that 60,000 men would be needed to drive the rebels out of it, and if they were to be fought down to the Gulf of Mexico 200,000 would be needed. Recovering from his amazement Mr. Cameron passed to irritation. The whole thing appeared to him preposterous, and the retinue of reporters he carried around with him soon took their cue. When the party reached Washington the newspapers had it that General Sherman was crazy. The idea became quite popular. "Crazy Sherman" ran the rounds of the press, and the soldier who told unpleasant truths was quietly shelved from his command. He went out under a cloud; the Washington people, and the public who had only heard of him through the newspapers, honestly believing that the anxieties of his position had affected his mind. This was the history of Sherman's first six months in active service.

The next episode presents him as the lieutenant of Grant in his Western campaigns. In the grand strategy of the war it was committed to General Grant to open the Mississippi from St. Louis to New Orleans. From the spring of 1862 till July, 1863, when Vicksburg fell, he was engaged in this work; and in the spring of 1864, he was brought East to grapple with Lee in Virginia. Sherman had emerged from under the cloud by his conduct at the hard-fought battle of Shiloh, where he was wounded and had three horses shot under him—a trifling matter which he forgets to mention in his "Memoirs," being wholly absorbed in discussing the strategy of the action. That bloody day transformed the "crazy Sherman" of the newspapers into the daring and skill-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ful general, to whose efforts the commander publicly attributed his success. From thence on Sherman rose in the public estimation, was promoted to important commands, received thanks for his part in the siege and capture of Vicksburg, and when Grant was brought East the unanimous election of the authorities and of the public was that Sherman was his proper successor in the West.

Here begins the third and most brilliant episode of his career in the war. The Mississippi had been opened, the Confederate armies were gathered at points east of it. Grant was already fighting Lee in Northern Virginia, but the vast region south of Virginia was protected by the armies of Gen. Joe Johnston. The richest part of the great territory was Georgia, and Johnston held the gateways to it from the northwest at Dalton, which covered the approaches to Atlanta, a city of foundries and munitions of war. Against him Sherman was ordered to operate. It is as the opponent of Johnston and Hood that the world at large knows General Sherman. Johnston was the commander standing next to Lee, as Sherman stood next to Grant; and the Civil War ended when Sherman received the surrender of Johnston's armies. The long fight between them began in May, 1864, when Sherman moved against him at Dalton. He fought him down to Atlanta in an almost continuous battle, and the route has become historic ground by reason of these successive contests. They present the spectacle of two skilled soldiers fighting each other in thoroughly scientific fashion, the one using his superior numbers to drive his opponent back, the other availing himself of every resource the nature of the country afforded to contest each inch of ground he yielded. The fine play of intellect between the two men in the midst of these scenes of carnage is strikingly brought out in the "Memoirs," where the General says that whenever he had made a move which put Johnston at a disadvantage, he considered what a first-class soldier would be likely to do to counteract it, and that line of action Johnston invariably took. Thus they reached Atlanta, where the Confederate authorities superseded Johnston, being dissatisfied with his retreating method of fighting, and gave the command to the daring but less scientific Hood. Forced to evacuate Atlanta in September, Hood fell upon Sherman's long thin line of communication back nearly to his sources of supply at Nashville, in Kentucky, and seriously broke it up. The alter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

native was then presented to Sherman either to fritter away the strength of his splendid army in chasing Hood off his lines, or to cut loose from all communications and march from Atlanta to the sea.

His famous march to Savannah gave the military world the finest example of the use of the flying column which military history presents. Its purpose was destruction; not of men, but of what is just as effective in war, property. To destroy the sources of an enemy's supplies is as good as destroying him, for he is made helpless. Johnston's armies had been originally placed to protect great regions from which supplies were drawn, and Sherman first outfought these armies, and then left the remainder to range over a devastated country, finally meeting a bloody defeat from Gen. Thomas at Nashville, while he swept a path of wide desolation through Georgia to the sea-coast. The General has repeatedly expressed his surprise at the admiration this triumphal march excited, while his more arduous march from Savannah north through the Carolinas has passed with little attention, although that too was made independent of a base of supplies. But it is when a thing is done the first time that it strikes astonishment. The way to do it having once been shown, the novelty is gone. After his march from Atlanta, it was assumed as a matter of course that he would successfully march across the Carolinas, although that might be more difficult than the former. He did so march, thereby forcing the abandonment of Charleston and other seaboard points, and struck up to join Grant before Richmond. But before he could reach him, Lee had surrendered, and Sherman immediately after received the surrender of his old antagonist, Johnston, who had once again been restored to command and sent to oppose him. With that surrender the Civil War was over.

Here the ruthless soldier sheathes his sword and assumes the role of pacificator. He makes terms with his old antagonist. The novelist who has been picturing from his imagination such a military character as Sherman, would by a sort of logical necessity, make these terms harsh and cruel; for Sherman's name had become a synonym for ruthless destruction; he had declared war to be a cruelty which could not be refined, had applied the pitiless logic of military necessity to the depopulation of cities, and where his armies marched they left a broad track of desolation. The memorandum of surrender was sent to Washington and im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mediately disapproved. The terms were "too liberal." Admitting that the soldier erred in stepping beyond the strict military line in this convention, it is yet a noble testimony to the character of the man that the error was on the side of generosity. In his letters the General admits his folly in overstepping military bounds; but that he, the fierce soldier, in whose nature mercy was declared to have no part, should have erred on the side of mercy, is one of those surprising facts which prove anew that truth is stranger than fiction. But the world had then known him only in war, when his portraits showed the stern countenance and the piercing eye with its eagle look.

In peace, and when honored old age has come upon him, yet not abated his vigor, for he and Father Time seem on the best of terms, we have come to know "Uncle Billy" in quite a different way. We see him now, when his hair has turned white, and his stubbly grey beard is close cropped, taking his rest after the labors of an eventful life; cheery as a lark, flying about as restless as ever, kissing all the pretty girls presented to him, full of original sayings, and rich with quaint humor. He likes to attend a public dinner occasionally, and make a characteristic after-dinner speech. Sometimes the old fighter gets uppermost in him, and he writes peppery letters. When he does he is bound to tread on corns. Thereupon all the little pigmies of the press raise a frightened cry. "There's General Sherman again! He's always saying something dreadful. Why *will* he say such things!" Why—because the old warrior has a right to. He has earned it, if any man has. He has a right to say anything he pleases.

Discussing the General as a presidential candidate, it would probably be argued that little is known of his views on any but purely military questions, or questions growing out of the war which time has settled. This is true in a measure, because the economic questions which are now political issues are of a later growth. But this is of little moment. They are chiefly matters for Congressional action solely. One of the most successful Presidents we ever had was General Jackson. Though economic subjects were the main issues in the politics of his time, no one has ever charged that the old soldier was wanting in clear insight or decided views upon them. Neither would General Sherman be found wanting in just as decided views as ever Jackson expressed on any subject to which he applied his vigorous intellect. He was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a novice in the banking business when he held his bank sound amid the general crash in San Francisco. The General has shown us in his book with what nervous force he can write. There are no dull lines in the two volumes of his "Memoirs." Every page reads as with a ringing word of command through it. His letters are models of style—strong, condensed, and telling exactly what he means. If he had to send messages to Congress they would bear the same stamp—the stamp of the man.

It is not often that the soldier can write of battles as well as he fights them; but the bent of General Sherman's mind is analytic, and he explains an action as perfectly as he plans it. All his fighting was thoroughly scientific. The Southern papers called him "the great Yankee flanker," which is as high praise as a soldier could ask. Nothing caused the Southern people more humilation, as shown by their newspaper comments at the time, than that Atlanta fell without a great battle. A short fight for the possession of a railroad settled its fate. This is war on scientific principles, and the mind which can conceive the strategy necessary for such success, and the will which carries it through, make its possessor eminent in either war or peace, as opportunity offers. Not the least interesting of the incidents of the Georgia campaign is the picture of General Sherman in his tent carefully studying the county tax assessors' reports of Georgia, to ascertain from the valuation what counties would furnish most subsistence to his marching armies. As to pure party politics, General Sherman is intensely averse to them. Least of all would he be in any sense a "bloody shirt" candidate. He has never given the slightest leaning to that objectionable phase of partisanship. He is too broad-minded to take so narrow a view of the country, and too thoroughly independent to conceal or disguise his convictions. As President the South would find in him not the ruthless soldier of 1864, but the generous victor as he appeared making terms of peace with General Johnston, once his opponent and now his old-time friend. The General himself is inclined to regard any one who speaks of him in connection with the Presidency as harboring evil designs on his peace of mind and well being; but for all that there are those who look to him only with respect and affection, who would delight to see the honors of a long life crowned by his election as Chief Magistrate of the country he has served so well.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A PERILOUS BALANCE.

THE almost equal division of American citizens between two great political parties is often alluded to as a subject for congratulation. The superlatively wise independent, assuming that all decided convictions must be insincere, and all positive action mischievous, tells us in a philosophic tone that it is very fortunate when the opposition party in a legislative assembly is so strong as to be a constant check upon the majority. The optimistic statesman speaks complacently of the people as acting up to their honest convictions—half being convinced one way, and half the other, when the same facts and arguments have been laid before them all! To my mind, this equal division is at once our most serious disadvantage and our deepest disgrace. It proves either a disinclination to think, or a determination not to be honest. If there is no essential difference between the characters and policies of the two parties, if in every canvass there is an equal amount of right and wrong, honesty and dishonesty, wisdom and unwisdom, in their conduct and purposes, then we are all fools, expending our time, our money, and our temper to secure a triumph of Tweedledum over Tweedledee. But if in any canvass there is a right and a wrong side to the question at issue, about half of all the voters are either inexcusably ignorant or criminally dishonest. If with all our colleges, all our common schools, all our newspapers, all our periodicals, all our pulpits, all the free discussion that is carried on throughout the land, never more than a trifle over half of the voters can find out what is the wise and honest course to be pursued—and even they seem to find it out rather because their own party happens to be right in that particular canvass, than because they have applied the proper tests to the principles and facts under discussion—then of what use are all these educational institutions and processes? If the citizen cannot learn from them his first duty to the community, how

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much is the state benefitted by schools, pulpits and presses? The young man that reads the papers only to learn the score of a base-ball game or the exact minutes and seconds of a yacht race, and can master no more of the political history and condition of his country than is expressed in an ephemeral party cry, might as well not have learned his letters.

In a presidential election we cast millions of votes, and the popular majority is seldom more than one or two per cent. of the whole. In 1884, for example, in a vote of over ten millions, there was a plurality for the successful candidate of less than two-thirds of one per cent. It is nonsense to call such a vote the triumph of certain principles or the vindication of any policy. It was simply the shifting of a little ballast; and if the Republican instead of the Democratic candidate had been successful, it would only have been by the shifting of a little ballast to the other side. If a hundred honest men persist in dividing themselves into fifties, we must expect to see two or three knaves step in to determine the question at issue and secure the results. One of the practical effects of this state of things is seen over and over again in our legislatures, where a hundred days are spent in doing badly what ought to be done well in ten. When a great question gets into politics, it cannot be thrown out again by any one per cent. majorities. A minority that constitute forty-nine per cent. of the whole will forever resolve to try it again, hoping to shift the ballast and have better luck next time. Not only is no question ever settled permanently until it is settled right, but it must also be settled by a decisive majority, not a wavering fragment whom the next wind of political passion or sophistical discussion may swing to the other side. When serious questions are before the country, after they have been discussed constantly for five months and talked over at every fireside, the vote ought to show, not merely a bare majority for the right, but a majority of at least twenty to one. For example, Mr. Cleveland and his party came into power making certain charges against the opposing party and certain promises for themselves. If those charges have been sustained and those promises fulfilled, then we should this year elect Mr. Cleveland, or whatsoever other candidate his party may prefer to nominate, by a majority that will look like another era of good feeling. On the other hand, if the charges have not been sustained and the promises not fulfilled, we should sweep them out of power by a vote that will look like the day of judg-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment. It is safe to say that there is not an intelligent man in the country who does not know or cannot find out which of these suppositions is true; but it is also safe to say that we shall have neither an era of good feeling nor a day of judgment. It is always a pitiful thing to see a President who is the soul of honesty, and has administered his office for the benefit of the country alone, compelled to work up his own vindication by pulling the pot-house wires and resorting to every piece of trickery known to demagogues and charlatans, in order to secure renomination and re-election. His vindication is a task that belongs to all the honest men of the country, without regard to party. Of what use are fair-promising platforms and lofty letters of acceptance, unless we punish their violation and reward their fulfillment? If our memories are not four years long, let us shorten the presidential term.

But the schoolmen tell us that the parties are founded on deep-seated antagonistic principles, and they discourse learnedly about the "strict-constructionists" and the "loose-constructionists," telling us how they strive to expand or compress the power of the Federal Constitution. Some of their readers and pupils believe them, and for years afterward go to the polls pondering whether they would better vote for strict construction or for loose construction. In practical politics there is no such thing. On the one hand, the party designated as strict-constructionist has never been known to hesitate, when itself in possession of the National Government, to stretch the powers of the Constitution as far as their elasticity would permit and the party needs required. On the other hand, the party designated as loose-constructionist has never succeeded in destroying any right, unless it was an alleged right to destroy the Constitution itself.

It seems to me that the remedy for the present state of affairs is to be found, not in less partisanship, but in a more honest and better informed partisanship. We impress upon our young men such maxims as "in union there is strength," but we forget to teach them that in union without intelligence there is mischief. There should be a complete reform in our methods of conducting a political canvass. In a country that contains Bunker Hill and Gettysburg, with a generation that reveres Washington and remembers Lincoln, there ought to be manliness enough to put away the clap-trap of brass bands and fireworks, to recoil from the infamy of campaign falsehoods, and to settle a perfectly plain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question on its perfectly plain merits. Any other course simply belongs to that smartness which is not wisdom. We should have less jingle and better journalism. Political managers tell us that the brass band and the sky-rocket have their effect and are necessary to secure a certain class of votes; to which the proper answer is, that it would be better to let such votes go where they will, and expend the effort in winning votes that carry with them the power of intelligence and the weight of character. Any fool can buy a sky-rocket, and put a match to it; but sky-rocket votes have never determined a question so that it remained settled. The first century of our national history furnishes some remarkable examples of sky-rocket votes, and teaches their insignificance.

In this day of newspapers, we ought to be able to look to journalism for the correction of public abuses and the enlightenment of ballot-casters. But the same argument that I have brought against the one per cent. majorities holds good also against the great engine that should change them. When a new political journal enters the field it is generally not because the man behind it feels himself intrusted with a mission to expound and circulate important truths, but because its proprietor has calculated that that community contains enough people of his party to support a paper that will keep telling them what they already believe. In the determination to uphold their own side at all hazards, by every means, and under all circumstances, a large part of our public press has sunk to the moral level of a Tombs lawyer. And for this, not so much the editors as the readers are to be blamed. So long as a political journal is read mainly or wholly by people of its own politics, who applaud it as a champion without regard to its truthfulness, so long it is likely to be reckless. Criticisms and exposures from the other side do not hurt it. The remedy might be found in an application of the ancient motto—To each, his own. A mendacious journalist should be even surer of rebuke from his friends than from his opponents. But who ever heard of a Republican rebuking a Republican paper for lying to help the Republican party? Who ever heard of a Democrat rebuking a Democratic paper for lying to help the Democratic party? Who ever heard of a Mugwump rebuking a Mugwump paper for lying on all sides? Unfortunately, it is not always the direct and demonstrable falsehood that is indulged in, but the cunning of misrepresentation acquired by long practice. "A lie that is half the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

truth," says the poet, "is ever the blackest of lies," and an instructive chapter might be written on the Jesuitry of journalism.

I am not unmindful of the fact that there is some noble and sincere journalism in our country, and many of our brightest minds have devoted themselves to it. But it is an awful satire on our civilization to find on one page of a widely circulated paper the utmost pains taken to give us the odd half second of a horse race and the exact calibre of the revolver used by some poor suicide, while on another page equal pains are taken to obscure the real bearings of a question that may be of the utmost importance to sixty million people. We can hardly look for betterment in a non-partisan press. It sounds high-toned and philosophical to talk of independent journalism; but has independent journalism ever accomplished anything except occasional mischief? Horace's celebrated maxim about the safety of middle courses, has for nineteen centuries furnished excuses to the intellectually indolent, the time-server, and the moral coward, and has wrought incalculable harm. When the ship is in a storm, a persistent refusal either to port or to starboard the helm simply leaves her wallowing in the trough of the sea. And our political ship is always in a storm.

Once on a time, when a father asked for advice about sending his boy to college, he was answered, "Send him to any good college, except one controlled by your own religious denomination; do not send him there under any circumstances." Similar advice, if it could be followed, might benefit the citizen as to his political duties. If every voter would subscribe for and read not only a paper whose politics were consonant with his own but also one of opposite views, the standard of journalism would immediately rise, and with it the standard of political morality. In the mean while, I should like to see trial made of what looks to me like a promising experiment. Let us have a metropolitan journal in which all the important news shall be given accurately and concisely, and the unimportant excluded. Let a line be drawn down through the middle of the editorial page, and half of that page placed under the supervision of an able and sincere Democratic editor, and the other half under the supervision of an equally able and sincere Republican editor. With equal ability and enforced honesty, both sides addressing the same audience, the results would necessarily be determined by the weight of truth.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So long as the respectable men of the country allow themselves to be divided into two equal parties, so long policies will be determined and spoils gathered by bosses, floating characters, and such cranks as choose to band themselves into little make-weight parties that constitute balances of power. The occupations of all such ought to be swept away by majorities of twenty to one, majorities so flexible that they can be cast one way at one election and the opposite way at the next. Aside from all moral questions, the present method of conducting a canvass, with its excitements and its uncertainties, lays an enormous tax upon the people, and it is time it were abolished. If we keep on in this way, we shall arrive sooner or later at a crisis in which a vital question will be at issue, and the minority unwilling to submit. If that minority is almost equal to the majority, we know what comes next; for we have seen it frequently in the South American republics, and have experienced it once ourselves.

ROSSITER JOHNSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A DEFENSE OF PUGILISM.

I IMAGINE that most of those who read the above heading and who consider themselves thoroughly refined and civilized, will hurriedly turn over these pages with the remark: "There *can* be no defense." Such a statement assumes a great deal, so much that no one has the right to make it who has not for himself gone carefully and fairly into the subject of which he speaks.

The custom of contests between man and man merely for the honor of victory, or for a prize—usually for both—is of great antiquity. Over two thousand years ago the statue of Jupiter, at Olympia, looked down from its lofty pedestal upon the flower of all Greece assembled to hear poetic and musical contests, and to behold athletic games, among which pugilism was one of the most prominent features, and such pugilism! No blow was dealt there with the naked hand, but the ponderous cestus of leather and metal gave a deadly import to the contest. One event, the "pancration," a combination of boxing and wrestling, was closely akin to such fighting of modern times as is carried on under what are known as the "London Rules."

Were these people barbarians who delighted in this spectacle, who greeted the laurel-crowned victor with their tumultuous plaudits, who bore him to his home, not through the city gates, but over a section of the wall leveled for his triumphal entry; and who honored him almost as a demigod to the end of his days? Listen to what Macaulay says of the ancient Athenians:

"There seems to be every reason to believe that in general intelligence the Athenian populace far surpassed the lower orders of any community that has ever existed. . . . .

"Let us for a moment transport ourselves in thought to that glorious city. Let us imagine that we are entering its gates in the time of its power and glory. A crowd is assembled round a portico. All are gazing with delight at the entablature; for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Phidias is putting up the frieze. We turn into another street; a rhapsodist is reciting there; men, women, children are thronging round him; the tears are running down their cheeks, their eyes are fixed, their very breath is still, for he is telling how Priam fell at the feet of Achilles, and kissed those hands—the terrible, the murderous—which had slain so many of his sons. We enter the public place; there is a ring of youths, all leaning forward with sparkling eyes and gestures of expectation. Socrates is pitted against the famous atheist from Ionia, and has just brought him to a contradiction in terms. But we are interrupted. The herald is crying, 'Room for the Prytanes!' The general assembly is to meet. The people are swarming in on every side. Proclamation is made. 'Who wishes to speak?' There is a shout and a clapping of hands; Pericles is mounting the stand. Then for a play of Sophocles, and away to sup with Aspasia. I know of no modern university which has so excellent a system of education."

Tell me, is not the verdict of such a nation worthy of some consideration even by the side of that of the refinement of to-day?

Strange to say, the most violent opponents of that contest which, with averted heads, they stigmatize as cruel, brutal, and degrading, even women will read with pleasure of the exploits of Hercules and Pollux, will thrill over the battle between Entellus and Dares, as told by Virgil, and will revel in the glory of the tournaments of the middle ages, which were nothing more nor less than prize fights, where Death, clad in the gorgeous tabard of martial heraldry, trumpeted the signal to engage, and where the prize, the horse and arms of a conquered knight, was no trifling acquirement for the victor.

Now, it is probable that the man of "progress" will point triumphantly to the pugilism of to-day, to the generally low and depraved characters of the men who engage in and encourage it, to the dishonesty and blackguardism which characterize most of its battles. But what weight is there in an argument based upon pugilism as its opponents have made it? A bad artist might as well say, "Painting is not beautiful. See! here is a picture I have just completed and it is execrable." For many years pugilism has rested under the ban of the law. All the respectable element—I use the term advisedly—have bowed their heads in ac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quiescence and have left the ring side to the company of those who have no characters to lose, to natural lawbreakers and outlaws; and then, forsooth, the logical lawmaker points to his own handiwork—to pugilism as degraded by him and his laws—and tries to draw thence his argument against it. The worthlessness of such a point must be very apparent.

Let us now briefly examine the other charges which he invariably makes when he condescends so far. He says pugilism is "brutal, cruel, demoralizing and degrading."

The first of these means nothing by itself. If he establishes any of his other points I will concede him this.

But he says it is cruel! We generally associate the idea of cruelty with pain or suffering inflicted upon an unwilling object. Bull fights are cruel, where horses and bulls are tortured and killed for the amusement of spectators. Dog fights are cruel because the dumb animals, deliberately trained for the purpose, are set to mangle each other at the word of their masters. Fox-hunting, with all its social prestige, is unquestionably cruel; and the combats of gladiators at Rome, where slaves and prisoners of war were forced to kill each other for the pleasure of a dissolute populace, were cruel in the highest degree. But how can it be called cruel to allow two men in full possession of their senses to engage with mutual willingness in what they regard merely as a rough game in which they are well aware that both will probably get more or less hurt?

"Demoralizing and degrading" are two high-sounding words of similar and rather generic import. We can discuss them together. Whom, then, does pugilism demoralize and degrade? the fighters or the spectators? Surely not the former! They have been subjected for a long time before to a régime of discipline and self-denial. These are neither demoralizing nor degrading—quite the reverse. They come to the ring side usually with no hard feelings toward each other, but fired with a desire to win, for which honor they are ready to take the chances of such pain and suffering as may come—in short, with the same spirit that inspired the Olympian contestant and the mail-clad knight whom we all unite in admiring; and the rough sport which follows is one in which the prime requisites of success are courage, endurance, and a lofty contempt for physical pain. Usually when all is over the former antagonists shake hands and frequently become

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fast friends. Is there any other sport which calls out such high qualities? Do kindly feelings so often survive the contests of the law court or the Stock Exchange, of the Senate or the vestry-room?

Oh! but perhaps the spectator is the one who is demoralized and degraded. Well, in the first place, no one need be present who does not so desire. In the second place, those who go for the pleasure of seeing blood flow, and bruises given and received, are probably pretty well past degradation or demoralization. But there are other considerations which may lead a man to the ring side, although our sentimentalist will be probably unable to understand such feelings. One may take pleasure in the contemplation of skill, adroitness, and strength; of unflinching courage, of steady coolness, and of endurance in bearing fatigue and pain with equanimity. High, manly qualities these, are they not? Possibly so far from demoralizing or degrading the onlooker, they may tend to elevate his ideas of the braver capabilities of human nature; just as the spirit of persecuted sects has been often exalted by witnessing the courageous deaths of their martyrs.

I hardly think that the most bitter opponent of the ancient game will maintain that the mere sight of blood is demoralizing or degrading. That would be a dangerous sentiment to inculcate. Civilization and refinement are excellent things, but they must not be confused with mere womanishness, nor must men learn to faint at the sight of blood as a proof of their refinement. It would be a serious matter for surgery, for philanthropy, and for national safety to allow such ideas to gain headway.

It may be argued that death sometimes occurs in the ring. So it does. So does it occur on the football, the baseball, the cricket, and the polo fields, not to mention the dangers of coasting, riding and driving. Nay, if the objector will so far unbend as to examine the statistics, he will find that more deaths occurred last year in this country from riding and driving accidents than have been laid to pugilism since 1800. If he objects to a sport because of danger to life, let him first pass a law forbidding the use of horses for all purposes of pleasure, and then return to his attack upon pugilism.

But the strongest sentiment underlying all this opposition is one which, while it exists in the minds of a certain class, has yet,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perhaps, never been distinctly formulated, and I hope needs only to be formulated to be condemned by men who do not place a sickly sentimentality above all other considerations. I refer to the sentiment underlying the unmistakable crusade which is being preached against every sport the practice of which involves any risk of bodily harm. Once let such a feeling become the touchstone of civilization and refinement and you put a premium on cowardice. Impress it upon the boy that physical pain is the greatest evil, that he must carefully avoid every amusement in which he is apt to get hurt, and you are in a fair way to develop a nation of contemptible sybarites. Yet there is no mistaking the tendency. The same hue and cry is raised by the same people whenever a man is hurt at football, and the colleges are besieged with advice to abolish that "brutal pastime." Can any sane and unprejudiced man believe that the promulgation of such a doctrine will improve a race?

And now a word upon the present condition of affairs, which I am very ready to admit could scarcely be worse. Probably about as much fighting, such as it is, is done, as if there were no laws against it; but it is done among men who are not likely to elevate any sport which they engage in or patronize. Fair play and honesty are the first things looked for by the true admirer of pugilism, and I am glad to be able to say that they were the first things found in the prosperous days of the ring. Petty meanness, hippodroming, trickery, foul play, and the inordinate greed for money—all well nigh unknown among the old fighters—are now the natural attributes of a sport which is almost wholly in the hands of a proscribed class.

Remove the proscription, regulate and control pugilism, so that those who feel no interest shall not be annoyed by those who desire to follow the "manly art," punish all abuses as they merit; and see if in time, when you have begun to overcome the evil influences you have let loose, you will not find the school-boy, as of old, settling his petty disputes with his fists and then making friends with his antagonist, instead of running with his tale to the teacher and inaugurating an enmity which may, perhaps, last through life. See if you will not find men of the lower classes again deciding their quarrels in a way not dangerous to life, instead of appealing to pistol or knife on the slighest provocation, until at last a sentiment shall arise to brand the coward who invokes such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

allies with a less endurable stigma than any court can put upon him, and that too among associates who now seem to regard a condemnation as wiping out his fault and entitling him to the sympathy of his fellows.

Old statistics show the influences which the fair and manly rules of the London ring had upon the very roughs of that metropolis. Not to mention the much less frequent use of deadly weapons, such a thing as striking or kicking a fallen man was practically unknown in the lowest street brawl, and an infraction of the recognized code gave the offender but a sorry chance to escape from the justly infuriated bystanders. Any policeman in New York can tell how that compares with what he constantly sees to-day.

Come then! let thinking men who value their manhood set themselves in array, both against the army of those who, unmanly themselves, wish to see all others reduced to their own level, and against the vast following who, caught by such specious watchwords as "progress," "civilization," and "refinement," have unthinkingly thrown their weight into the falling scale. Has mawkish sentimentality become the shibboleth of the progress, civilization and refinement of this vaunted age? If so, then in Heaven's name leave us a saving touch of honest, old-fashioned barbarism! that when we come to die, we shall die, leaving men behind us, and not a race of eminently respectable female saints.

DUFFIELD OSBORNE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESIDENT'S PANACEA.

THE main legislative issue before the country to-day is unquestionably the Tariff issue. Since the war of the Rebellion no question so momentous, or so threatening of disquiet and danger, has been appealed to the judgment of the American people.

Upon this vital and vexed issue the Chief Magistrate of the country has set forth his views. But before action is finally taken in one direction or another, it is well to pause and call a halt to consider whether these immature judgments on the Tariff do not assail the very firesides of the wage-earners and imperil the vast capital employed in the mighty industries that have taken root and attained their growth and vitality under protection.

The trouble in the conduct of such discussions as the Tariff question calls forth often lies in the absence of practical knowledge of the interests involved. This practical knowledge can come from no better source than from leading representatives of the great industries of the country. Certainly no better spokesmen would seem obtainable than the men conspicuously connected with the most important interests now threatened.

It might naturally have been supposed that such testimony would have been sought by the Ways and Means Committee at Washington. Not only, however, has such testimony been ignored, but actually rejected when offered. But an appeal lies from the majority of that committee to the people, and it now finds expression in this REVIEW, a large number of gentlemen identified with great interests affected presenting their views, in answer to the question as to what would be the effect upon their particular industries or interests of any legislative measures passed upon the lines of President Cleveland's message.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Limitations of space have forbidden any further multiplication of these views or an absolutely complete representation of the interests involved. The industries embraced, however, in this valuable collection of opinions furnish sustenance to vast multitudes of American workmen, whose homes would be threatened by any unwise revision of the Tariff, while the capital involved runs into billions.

Already the evil effects of the President's message are sadly apparent in the "Mills Bill"—a measure directed against many industries of the country, and recently described to me by a leading manufacturer, of Democratic persuasion, as "the most ingenious bill possible for shutting up all the iron furnaces of the Atlantic coast."

Indeed, we have only to look at the records of Congress to discover how many Democrats of standing, men of such genuine Democratic stamp and statesmanlike qualities as Mr. Hewitt, are committed to a policy which differs as widely as the poles from that laid down in the message of the Democratic President.

Not all the sophism in the world can veil from the American workman the inference that this message bears within it a death warrant to his creature comforts. No figures and no sophisms could reconcile him to the lot of the laborer as we may see him in the older countries, badly clad in his hovel, and living in want and ignorance. It was not for this that the emigrant came to seek a new home in a new country.

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

IRON AND STEEL.

The effect of the tariff legislation recommended by the President in his recent message would be disastrous to the iron and steel industries of the country, as have been the attempts to carry out such lame theories in the past. Henry Clay said in 1832: "If I were to select any term of seven years since the adoption of the present constitution which exhibited a scene of the most widespread dismay and desolation, it would be exactly that term of seven years which immediately preceded the establishment of the tariff of 1824. If the term of seven years were to be selected of the greatest prosperity which this people have enjoyed since the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

establishment of their present constitution, it would be exactly that period of seven years which immediately followed the passage of the tariff of 1824."

The tariff of 1846 drove into bankruptcy ninety per cent. of all those engaged in the manufacturing of iron in Pennsylvania. Abram S. Hewitt wrote in 1849: "Of fifteen rail mills, only two are in operation, doing partial work, and that only because their inland position secured them against foreign competition for the limited orders of neighboring railroads; and when these are executed, not a single rail mill will be at work in the land."

Employment of workmen was greatly diminished, resulting in extremely low wages for those so fortunate as to secure it. In this city of Pittsburgh, famed for the industry and frugality of its citizens, as well as the skill and genius of its mechanics, thoughtful men, with strong arms and willing hands, were reduced to idleness and want. These worthy people were compelled to accept the charities of the more fortunate, and get from the soup stations, established for the purpose, sustenance for themselves and their families, and this at a time when the products of the farm were absurdly cheap in Pennsylvania; when in the Western States corn was burned for fuel, and other grain remained in stacks from year to year unthreshed. These dire consequences were not confined to the iron interests, but affected all branches of industry alike throughout the country. The Government was brought to the verge of bankruptcy by the same cause.

The full force of the blow of the tariff for revenue only of 1846 was not felt because of the Irish famine, which created a demand for all our surplus grain; the Mexican War, which gave employment to men and circulation to money; the acquisition of California, and the discovery of precious metals; the wars and rumors of wars in Europe, which caused an abnormal demand for our products.

The tariff is simply a question of wages and rate of interest. If it were possible to make the interest rate here as low as it is in other countries for business purposes, before we shall have acquired a corresponding amount of capital; if it were wise, desirable or possible to reduce wages to the pinching standard of other countries, where every member of a family, old and young, male and female, is compelled to labor to earn a miserable living, there would be no necessity for a protective tariff, because our natural

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advantages are quite equal to the best. But, if we favor "the policy which inspires labor with hope, and crowns it with dignity; which gives safety to capital, and protects its increase; which secures political power to every citizen, comfort and culture to every home," we must have protection against the products of foreign cheap labor, which will assure contentment as well as loyalty to, and veneration for, a government by the people.

In addition to the wonderful development of this great country since 1860, are not the comfortable homes of the working men, and the grand aggregate of deposits in savings banks acquired since that time, notwithstanding the intervening wasting war, indubitable testimony in behalf of a protective tariff?

Why the President associates the tariff with combinations and trusts is not clear. They are temporary expedients against fierce competition, which only serve (even when conducted within the law) to invite increased competition, and render the last state of those who join them worse than the first. George Stephenson said that "where combination is possible, competition is impossible." In this land of liberty, the proposition must be reversed. Where competition is possible, combination is impossible.

Mr. Cleveland's logic in endeavoring to show that man's condition may be bettered by diminishing his ability to earn, is hazy, to say the least.

B. F. JONES.

PITTSBURGH, Pa.

IRON ORE.

In the production of last year's grand aggregate of American iron and steel, there were used 12,500,000 tons of iron ore. Of this quantity, about 11,300,000 tons were raised from our American mines and carried by American ships and railroads to the furnace and the mill, while 1,194,301 tons were imported, mainly from Spain, Africa, Italy and Cuba, and paid a duty of seventy-five cents per ton. Every ton of these importations *displaced* a ton of American ore. About three-fifths of this foreign ore took the place, along the Atlantic seaboard, of Northern New York, Champlain, Hudson River, New Jersey, and Eastern Pennsylvania ores, and two-fifths went over the mountains to displace at Johnstown, Pittsburgh and Wheeling, an equal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quantity of Lake Superior and Missouri ores. Southern ore industries, newly born, will soon feel the same pressure, the same loss of market. Hampton Roads will be the entrepot for foreign ores into Southern ore fields.

But why not remove this small defense of American ore production, seventy-five cents per ton? A tariff framed that way would be in line with the President's ideas. There is one supreme obstacle, the question of wages—wages for hundreds of thousands of laborers. The drill and the pick below the surface only begin the process. After them come the hoisting machinery, the docks, the railroads, the shipping; vast systems of interlocked, interdependent industries. In the mining and transportation to the mills and furnaces that consume it, of Lake Superior ore alone, $150,000,000 of capital is invested. There it is planted, and with all its enormous labor occupation. It takes the risk with its dependent labor, of waste and final destruction when mines become exhausted, or when its market, as in case of dispalcement by foreign ores, is destroyed. It must be remembered, too, that against the 40 miles of average distance that ores, fuel, and limestone, are carried to the furnace in Great Britain, are 400 miles in the United States.

Mr. Jeremiah Head, well known in the United States and in Europe, recently read a paper before the Mechanical Science Section of the British Association on the iron mines of Bilbao, Spain. He gave the following comparative statements:

The hours of labor *per week* were: At Bilbao, 72; in Cleveland District, England, 46; on Lake Superior, 55 to 60. Wages *per day* for drillers and miners at Bilbao, 60 to 72 cents; Cleveland, drillers and miners, $1.21; Lake Superior, drillers and miners, $2.25 to $2.75. Wages per day for common laborers at Bilbao, 36 to 60 cents; Cleveland, common laborers, 72 to 84 cents; Lake Superior, $1.60 to $2. Wages per day for boys or women, Bilbao, 24 to 36 cents; Cleveland, boys or women, 24 to 60 cents; Lake Superior, $1 to $1.25. Wages of miners, then, on Lake Superior are more than three and three-quarter times what they are at Bilbao, and more than double those paid in the Cleveland District. The labor cost to a ton of ore on Lake Superior would be ten times what it is at Bilbao, and more than four times what it is at Cleveland. The average metallic content of Lake Superior ore is a little more than Bilbao, but the labor cost of a ton of iron ore in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Lake Superior region would be at least eight or nine times that at Bilbao. Under these labor conditions and the present rate of duty, importations are likely to continue to increase. In that event wages in American ore production must decline, or a large number of American mines will be closed and the men pushed out to crowd laborers in other industries. This process began three years ago in New Jersey. Prof. George H. Cook, in his annual report for 1884, said: "The low price of iron ore and the light demand for ore at almost any figure have caused a large shrinkage in the production and closed many of our mines. The large and increasing importations of iron ore from Spain and Africa also operate against our mines." And yet the Revenue Reformer wants "free ore."

The *consumers* of ore, however, look further ahead. They said—the iron and steel manufacturers of the United States, assembled in convention at Cresson, Pa., September, 1882—by unanimous vote, that the duty on ore ought to be eighty-five cents per ton.

The Eastern Pig Iron Association, in whose district all the importations of ore are landed, in its official reply to the circular of tariff inquiry sent out by Secretary Manning, in November, 1885, vigorously opposed the lowering of the duty on ore. The retention of at least the present rate was strenuously urged in the interest of the safety and the permanent prosperity of the iron and steel manufactures of the United States. The full equalization of the labor cost, between foreign and domestic ores, would, of course, require a much higher duty than the present rate.

Mr. Andrew Carnegie, the largest buyer and consumer of iron ore in the United States, and who knows very well that the reliance of the American consumer for cheap manufactures of iron and steel must be upon American ore, very sharply puts the case in these words: "Spanish labor in the mines fifty cents per day, and labor in the mines of Lake Superior two dollars per day, with cost of transport less from Spain to seaboard furnaces than from Lake Superior to furnaces in Ohio and Pennsylvania, settled the question of free ore, as it will settle the question of free coal."

The iron ore of commerce is distinctively a product of enormous combinations of capital and labor. Its designation by theorists as "raw material" does not change its relations to the expended capital and labor, nor can such arbitrary and purely constructive

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

classification, to suit certain theories, impair its right to full protection.

GEORGE H. ELY.

CLEVELAND, O.

IRON AND STEEL.

WAGES, PRICES, AND PROFITS.

The passage of a measure by Congress reducing tariff duties on iron and steel on the lines of the President's message would result only in mischief and disaster. It would, to use the President's terms as applied to the tariff, be vicious, iniquitous and illogical. Vicious, because the industries would be badly disarranged and business unsettled and made precarious; iniquitous, because the wages of labor must necessarily be reduced; and illogical, because the evil sought to be rectified would simply be aggravated.

The President in his message speaks of the "immense profits" of manufacturers, from which we may infer that a reduction of tariff duties would reduce these profits to a normal level without interfering with the rates of wages now paid to labor.

The "immense profits" of the iron and steel manufacturers, we regret in some sense to say, exist only in the imagination of the President. The wages of iron and steel workers, that is, the labor engaged in our rolling mills, are regulated by "Scales of Prices," which are agreements entered into by employers and employés, basing wages on the selling price of iron and steel.

This system has been in existence for over twenty-five years, and by its operation the workingmen have obtained a very accurate knowledge of the cost of production of all grades, sizes and shapes of iron and steel, thus enabling them to receive such proportionate wages as to leave to the employer but a fair and reasonable margin for profit. The manufacturer must make a profit, and it being questionable whether American manufacturers make larger profits than English manufacturers—*i. e.*, a larger percentage on the invested capital—it follows that a tariff reduction on foreign products would quicken competition from abroad, reduce prices, and necessarily lower wages and cheapen materials; hence, it is very clear that the chief sufferers would be the workingmen.

The wages now paid English iron and steel workers are miserably low, while ours are receiving reasonable and fair wages.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Space will not admit of a list of comparative wages here. Common day labor is now getting in England from 48 cents to 72 cents per day; in this country from $1.25 to $1.75 per day. Skilled labor shows a greater difference still in favor of the American laborer. Puddlers are paid $5.50 per ton in this country; in England only $1.56 per ton. Heaters and rollers will earn from two to three times as much per day in this country as the same class of workmen in England, yet our workmen receive only fair wages.

The difference in the selling price of iron and steel in each country do not show in the same ratio. The price of a ton of good fibrous bar iron in this country is about $41.44: the same quality in England would be $31.50, a difference of only $9.94. The total wages paid in England in converting pig iron into bar iron is about $4.96, and in this country about $12.74 per ton. A significant fact is brought out if we add these wages to the price of pig iron in each country,—thus, in England, price of pig iron $11 per ton, wages as above $4.96—total, $15.96; price of bar iron $31.50; margin left for materials, wear and tear, insurance, taxes, profit, etc., $15.54. In this country, price of pig iron, $18 per ton; wages as above, $12.74, total, $30.74; price of bar iron, $41.44; margin for materials, etc., $10.70. Were it not for the higher governmental taxation in England, 23 per cent. against 5 per cent. in this country, the English manufacturer would be in a far better position than the American.

That we cannot stand a reduction of the tariff is very clear from the increased importations of last year. The least stiffening in prices, and we are on the danger line, and in comes the foreign product.

To reduce duties can therefore only result in larger importations; but to protect American industries we require such a revision of the tariff as to make it protective in all its parts.

JOHN JARRETT.

PITTSBURGH, Pa.

AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY.

The President's message is a radical plea for free trade. It has taken legislative shape in the "Dark Lantern Bill" recently introduced by Mr. Mills. This bill is sectional and partisan. If it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

becomes a law it will cripple many of the great industries of the country,—industries so interwoven that it is impossible to strike down one without injuring the others.

Free trade would be specially hurtful to our metal industries and to all their allied interests. The prosperity of the manufacture of agricultural implements and farm machinery depends directly upon the prosperity of the farmer. Whatever reduces his income limits our production. Free trade injures him, and, therefore, injures us. Protection benefits him, and, therefore, benefits us. It is claimed that under free trade the farmer can buy his agricultural implements, farm machinery, clothing, and other necessaries at greatly reduced prices. But he must not forget that free trade is sweeping in its effects, and, while it may cheapen his supplies, it will cheapen in still greater measure the value of his farm and all its products. The farmer now has protection of twenty cents per bushel on wheat; ten cents per bushel on rye, corn, oats, and barley; and corresponding protection on other farm products. Free trade will bring to our seaboard foreign wheat at lower prices, and at less cost for transportation than his grain can be brought from the great Northwest. He must then contend against wheat from India and Russia raised by labor at from five to fifteen cents a day. Foreign grain and foreign products will fix the price of his grain and his products. Protection means to the farmer higher prices, better crops, more valuable lands, and greater prosperity. It means, too, better markets. His home market is his best market. Now protection fosters manufacturing industries, increases the numbers employed in these industries, and decreases the numbers engaged in agriculture, and thus furnishes the farmer a larger market, with better purchasing capacity. The farmer in the States blest with manufacturing establishments more readily appreciates these benefits than the farmer of the great West, who suffers under the disadvantages of distance from his market.

What would be the effect of free trade upon the wages of the workmen? They now receive from forty to sixty per cent. higher wages than the men of like occupation abroad. They would be the greatest sufferers were free trade inflicted upon our country. Their wages would be placed on a level with the pauper wages of Europe with which they must compete.

They would barely be able to maintain themselves and their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

families. How then could they purchase and own their own homes as so many of them now do?

Workingmen should be the stanchest supporters of protection. While free trade would bring free wool and cheap clothing, it would lower wages fifty per cent. and raise the price of mutton forty per cent.; and the old story of free trade countries would be repeated in our land—"meat for the workingman once a week."

The capital and the competition within our own country will regulate the prices of every commodity.

Our government was created to bring the greatest good to the greatest number—the working classes. The second law placed upon its statute-book was for protection. Patrick Henry wisely suggested that a good way to judge the future was by the past. Our country has always prospered under the laws of protection. Her greatest statesmen of both political parties in the past (as well as the present) have been on the side of protection: and while our present tariff laws might with safety be readjusted upon some minor points, yet the policy of free trade is founded upon false theories.

The President allows the "surplus" to accumulate—when under existing laws it should have been applied toward paying the national debt—and then points to this "surplus" as an excuse for his free-trade message.

A. L. CONGER.

AKRON, O.

TEXTILE MACHINERY.

The probable effect of any measures passed pursuant to the line of President Cleveland's message on the industry I represent, which is the building of machinery for use in manufacturing cotton, wool and worsted yarns and cloths, would be paralysis and ultimately death.

The question is so serious that to answer it in a manner commensurate with its importance, involves determining the logical interpretation of the message, so far as it relates to the industries of this country; for, strange as it may seem, there are those who maintain that the message does not favor the policy of free-trade. Those who hold this opinion are not found only among the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adherents of the party with which the President is identified. All dispassionate thinkers, however, and the great majority of all political parties in the United States, the free-traders of England and the intelligent readers of all interested nations, agree that the message is a bold, candid and distinct free-trade paper.

Therefore, legislation on the line of Mr. Cleveland's message means the removal of the protective feature of our tariff laws, the enlargement of the free-list and the final opening of the markets of the United States to foreign competition.

It can be clearly shown that, in all protected industries where labor is the chief element of cost, the entire duty paid by the importer of the foreign article goes to the American work-people and not to the proprietors and capitalists. The effect, therefore, on the wages of workmen would be at first to reduce the amount. But, as it would be an undoubted impossibility to re-adjust at once all values upon the basis of foreign labor, the secondary result would be to deprive the wage-earner of employment in the industry under consideration.

If the duty of forty-five per cent. that nominally protects the American machine builder were removed, the machine user would be enabled to purchase mill-outfits at so large a reduction as utterly to defeat American competition. The hopelessness of the machine builder's condition would compel the discharge of his workmen and the closing of his works. But, with the ability to buy mill machinery at a price as much less as foreign is less than American labor, would come cheap goods, so cheap, that he must be a bold man who would undertake to make them in competition with English and German operatives.

Mills would stand idle, and those who now attend the spinning machine and the loom, as well as those who toil to build these useful machines, would be forced to seek other modes of gaining a livelihood, or, in default, to suffer in idleness. This is, without doubt, a gloomy picture, but, even without any legislation, the effect of the message has been to unsettle trade, reduce its volume and depress prices.

The work of man's hands, measured by the medium of exchange, fixes the measure of wealth. Consequently, such a reduction of duties as would reduce the exchangeable value of labor to the standard of any foreign people must cause widespread disaster.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perhaps, after the slow process of re-adjustment, new values would be established and, under new conditions, with a well-defined population of laborers and artisans, there might be a revival of industrial employments; but, of course, upon a basis of wages as low as paid in any competing country.

STOCKTON BATES.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa.

WOOL GROWING.

I am asked what would be the probable effect of any measures based on the lines of President Cleveland's message on the industry of sheep husbandry and wool-growing, and on the workmen's wages.

Very disastrous, I think. The slight reduction of duties on wool by the Act of 1883 has caused the slaughter of many sheep, and largely increased the importation of foreign wool. No one can have a reasonable doubt that the free admission of wool from countries so highly favored for its production, as regards soil and climate, as Australia and South America would destroy wool-growing in the United States, and inflict a terrible blow on woollen manufacturers as well.

The wages of workmen in every other industry would decline by reason of the increased competition resulting from a million or more flockmasters seeking other employments.

True, clothing and woolens would for a time at least be cheaper in price, but would they cost us less? Here is the delusion. The laborer, the merchant, the mechanic, the lawyer, doctor, preacher, buys his clothing by the labor or service that he sells.

Destroy one great industry and its workers distribute themselves among the several trades and professions remaining. Competition lowers prices. We may have less to pay for our clothing, but less to give in exchange for it, hence it will cost us more.

Nor would free wool give our manufacturers control of foreign markets. Free cotton has not. We consume at home say ninety-five per cent. of cotton manufactures and export five per cent. The cost of labor is the principal factor in the cost of production. To compete in foreign markets we must reduce wages, transportation, interest, etc., to foreign schedules. This we cannot, will not, should not do.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The problem to solve in economic legislation is not how to cheapen prices, but rather how to diversify, encourage and protect industrial occupations for our teeming population. Prices will take care of themselves in a country so large and with such varied climate and marvelous resources as ours. Consumers have abundant protection by reason of home competition. Monopoly cannot possibly exist beyond a brief period.

But the destruction of sheep husbandry and wool growing imperils the whole protective system, and should meet the united protest of all other industries. It is the chief protected industry of the farmer, common to every State and Territory. Agricultural constituencies are, or may be, supreme in legislation. Outside a few cities farmers constitute political majorities. They have a clear right to be heard.

Domestic sheep husbandry has incidental public advantages. It makes us independent of foreign nations for our supply of clothing, all-important in time of war, as we do not command the sea. It enriches our soil. It affords the readiest means of supplying a growing deficiency in animal food. Meat is the chief item of necessary expense in a large proportion of families.

The diminished cost of animal food by the protection of sheep husbandry, with adequate import duties on wool, would many times compensate for increased cost of woolen fabrics.

W. S. SHALLENBERGER.

ROCHESTER, Pa.

COTTON MANUFACTURES.

The people of the United States were surprised and startled at the dogmatic assertions in the President's message. Had he been better informed as to the probable effect of the measures proposed, he might have been more cautious.

His party having a clear majority in the House—the opposite majority in the Senate being very narrow—with the open threats made by the Free Trade Press to coerce those Democrats who differed from the President, are sufficient cause for solicitude on the part of manufacturers.

Never before in the history of the Government has a President in his message gone out of his way to attack and impugn a purely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

business class of the people, comprising men of both parties, pursuing in a legitimate way honorable callings which it has up to this time been the general policy of the Government to encourage and upbuild. This, with the Speaker's manifesto, and the extraordinary composition of the Committee of Ways and Means, are a sufficient notice to the industries of the country that they are to be put upon their defense.

What will be the effect upon the cotton industries of the country if the President and the majority of his party in Congress succeed in carrying out their policy?

The demand for home consumption of the cheaper and coarser grades of cottons was long ago fully met by the American manufacturer, and so close and sharp is the competition, that none but the very best mills under the ablest management have been able to work at a profit, some both North and South having gone into bankruptcy.

Although labor is not so large an element of cost in these as in the finer goods, the higher wages in this country have prevented our spinners from taking any large share of the trade in China and the East. There is then no outlet at home or abroad for an increased production of coarse fabrics. In the medium grades the same conditions exist. We cannot compete in the foreign market, and our own is fully supplied. The American consumer is cheaply supplied with every grade of cotton goods.

About one-fifth of the spindles of the country are making the finer grades of goods against which the foreigner maintains a sharp and quite successful competition in our own market.

There were imported into this country last year $29,150,058.83 worth of cotton manufactures, almost entirely the finer grades of fabrics and yarns. Any material reduction in the duties upon these goods would enable the foreigner to drive the domestic manufacturer out of the market unless he could find some means of cheapening the cost of the goods. The President's "free raw material" cannot help, because cotton bears no duty. The plant is fixed. Taxes and interest cannot be reduced. If these fine mills should be turned upon the coarser fabrics the market would be glutted, and all would go to ruin together. There would be but two methods of meeting the emergency—to stop a part of the machinery or reduce the wages of labor until the cost of the goods was at an equilibrium with those imported.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is a very simple statement, and to those unfamiliar with such matters it might appear very easy of accomplishment. But in these industrial contests none of the forces retire from the field until they are vanquished. That means a financial crippling and final stoppage of many establishments, operatives thrown out of employment, failure of traders who supply the work people, and of merchants and bankers who deal with the manufacturers. The operatives would not submit to a reduction of their pay without a contest; but in the end the inevitable result would be that labor must take its share of the reduction. Labor in cotton factories in America is about sixty-five per cent. higher than in Great Britain, twice as much as in France, two and a quarter times that in Switzerland and nearly three times what it is in Italy. The three former send us large quantities of fine cottons, and a very small reduction of duties would enable them to increase the quantity thrown upon our market largely, stopping our mills, throwing labor out of employment, with resultant injury that would not stop with those directly interested.

All kinds of business in a country are interdependent, and any material injury to one must sooner or later be felt by all, just as when you drop a pebble into the pond curling ripples reach the shore on every side and every drop of water becomes disturbed. The cotton spinners of America have fulfilled the predictions of the fathers of the Protective system. They furnish wares unexcelled in quality at prices at which the consumer cannot and does not complain. There are no trusts in the cotton business. This attempt to disturb and injure industries which have grown up under the system of Protection is a wanton attack upon labor and upon praiseworthy business enterprises which finds no justification in the condition of the country.

JONATHAN CHACE.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

FLAX, HEMP, AND JUTE MANUFACTURES.

The cultivation and preparation of flax, hemp and jute, and the manufacture of these fibres into yarns, twines, threads and woven fabrics, necessitates a large expenditure of skilled labor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The wages paid in other countries where flax, hemp, and jute goods are manufactured, are upon a very low scale as compared with the wages paid in our mills for the same kind of work.

There can be no reasonable doubt concerning the real meaning of President Cleveland's recent message to Congress. It has received the condemnation of no free foreign trader either in Europe or America. It has met with the approval of no real protectionist. It is, therefore, in fact a revenue reform or a free foreign trade message. Its recommendations and its logic, if carried into practical operation, would produce a complete revolution in the linen industry of the United States.

As will be seen from the following facts and figures, a tariff for revenue only will as effectually destroy the American linen industry as would absolute free foreign trade. For several years the cultivation of flax and hemp in the United States has steadily decreased, and the placing of these so-called raw materials on the free list will only hasten the time when the cultivation of these fibres will be numbered with the lost arts of our American industry.

In the manufacture of these fibres the real work is done by machinery, and Great Britain makes this machinery for all the world. The same spindle is capable of running as many revolutions per minute and turning off as much yarn per day in India, Russia or Germany as in the United States. A mere glance at the wages paid in different parts of the world will convince the most skeptical that our wages must go down if the tax upon foreign goods is reduced. Without this unhappy result the American mills cannot be operated in competition with foreign mills.

It must be remembered that ocean freights are no barrier to the foreign mills, since the raw material has to be brought over the same ocean route. The unavoidable shrinkage of the raw material in the process of manufacture is, in fact, a large item of protection to the foreign mill, freight upon the dead waste being avoided. From this ugly item the American mill can find no escape.

The following were the average weekly wages paid in the flax, hemp and jute spinning trade in different countries in 1886, as compiled by the Flax and Hemp Spinners' and Growers' Association of America, from the most reliable sources of information:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

	Spinners.	Carders.
United States (60 hours per week)	$7.00	$6.00
Great Britain (56 hours per week)	2.82	2.19
France (72 hours per week)	2.02	2.20
Germany (72 hours per week)	1.98	1.65
Eastern Russia (81 hours per week)	1.10	.....
Western Russia (72 hours per week)	1.12	1.12
India	.62	.60

It is impossible to reduce the tax upon the product of foreign goods without reducing American wages. The importation of yarns under the present tariff is forcing American mills into an unprofitable existence. Only a mere pittance of the woven fabrics consumed in this country is made at home, and many of these never will be made here under President Cleveland's proposed industrial policy until American working people are content to live on rice at a cent and a half a day, and clothe themselves with only a cloth about the loins. In a large area of our country this mode of life is impossible. If by law we attempt to starve the working people into such an existence, our climate would make it impossible, and the attempt should never be made.

E. A. HARTSHORN.

TROY, N. Y.

MANUFACTURES OF SILK.

The silk industry in the United States has been built up with great difficulty. There are several distict branches of it, one or two of which are very much older than the rest, and have made greater progress; most of them date their successes from very recent years; some are even now barely beginning, and doubtful of results. But their separate histories, so far as they go, are alike in these essential features:

(1) They begin with a long, arduous struggle:—an endeavor to compete with the European goods in possession of the market.

(2) In every instance our manufacturers have found it necessary to make better goods than those of Europe, as well as to sell at lower prices. This process has in each case to be continued until the American goods win a reputation superior to that of the European; and until, also, the popular prejudice in favor of foreign goods can be at least partially overcome.

(3) In its early stages each branch of the manufacture is an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experiment—often a very costly one, and subject to repeated failures. Both employers and employés have to learn their trade by experience, and years must be spent in training operatives and systematizing business. In most branches we are still serving our apprenticeship.

(4) Whenever any branch of the industry has achieved a measure of success against foreign competition, its attractions have caused many new concerns to start in the business, and a home competition—harder to meet than even the foreign—has been engendered, resulting in a notable lowering of prices and narrowing of margins of profit.

In all discussions of this topic, the great changes in trade which have been brought about by the steamship and telegraph must be fairly considered. Silk goods are of small bulk compared with their value; the present cost of bringing them from Europe to New York is scarcely greater than from a factory in an adjoining State; the difference in time of transit is barely a week; the order for them can be given by cable, and the settlement through banker's credits can be effected with equal ease.

The European manufacturer has cheaper capital, smaller expenses in many ways, an inherited experience, skilled operatives trained to the business, established reputation, a market in two hemispheres, and—more than all else—very low-priced labor.

To counterbalance these advantages, the American manufacturer has such protection as the tariff may afford. It is the bulwark of our industry.

What would be the effect of a material reduction of the duty on silk goods? Manifestly, a similar contraction of the industry in this country. Some hundreds of manufacturers, unable to wait until our Government could retrace its steps, would quit business except with lawyers and assignees. There would be a period of very hard times in the industry, both for employers and employed. Manufacturing here could be continued only by assimilating its conditions to those of Europe; that is, by reducing wages, so as to pay 25 or 50 cents per day to operatives who now get $1.00 to $1.50.

What would be gained by such reduction of duty?

Foreign manufacturers and their agents would gain the greatest advantage. The work that ceased here would be carried on in Europe.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perhaps for a while foreign silk goods would be cheaper, though the absence of American competition would soon enable Europeans to advance their prices. This at the utmost seems rather a doubtful advantage for working-people, whose families, with reduced wages, would be less able than they are now to buy the goods.

Also, in some way that has never been clear to me, the American manufacturer who when the tariff if reduced can scarcely compete with the foreign goods in this country, will then be enabled to obtain an export trade—*i. e.*, to compete with such goods in some other country.

England has made the experiment of reducing and finally abolishing the tariff on silk goods. We do not need to repeat that blunder. The results are well known: the home manufacture fell off enormously; an increased importation of French goods took the vacant place and has kept it ever since. Poverty descended on the chief sites of the industry; in Macclesfield there were for years thousands of houses untenanted, and from that "doomed town" there went forth a goodly number of emigrants who are now prosperous citizens of Paterson, N. J.

WM. C. WYCKOFF,
Secretary Silk Association of America.

NEW YORK, March 10.

WOOLENS AND WORSTEDS.

It chances that I need only point to the actual present condition of one industry in which I am engaged to illustrate the effect of tariff reductions, based upon the lines of the President's message. By a misapprehension of the value of the term "worsted," the tariff of 1883 lowered the duties upon this branch of woolen manufacture below the protecting point. The results have been vast importations of foreign worsteds, a large *increase* of revenue (which will doubtless surprise Mr. Cleveland), and an almost complete paralysis of the worsted industry in this country—which will certainly please and benefit foreign manufacturers. Fully one-half of the worsted machinery of the country is now idle and the remainder is kept running unprofitably, only to furnish employment to skilled operatives, in the hope that the discrimination against this industry is accidental and temporary, rather than the evidence of a settled purpose to destroy it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Avoiding abstract argument upon the benefits or the evils of the protective tariffs of the past twenty years, we may all admit that owing to their stimulation we have built up in this country, during that period, a vast and intricate industrial system whose foundations rest upon the protective idea, whose growth has absorbed such a proportion of the investments and the labor of the country, and has entwined itself so inextricably with its economic and social conditions that any legislation which is inimical to that system is equally so to the country at large. To lower the duties upon the products of any industry below the protecting point is to destroy that industry in this country, to make a gift of its pursuit and the benefits and employment derived therefrom to other peoples, and to increase the revenue receipts of the Government instead of diminishing them. The present condition of our worsted manufactures will sufficiently prove this. It is obvious therefore that the tariff should be kept at a point which permits the continuance of domestic manufactures. To do this ought not to be a difficult problem. Indeed the only difficulty seems to arise from a curious morbid mental attitude which the heat of argument appears to have developed in the minds of free trade advocates; many of these seem to regard manufacturers as a class who recklessly ply their pursuits and prey upon the community, and whose testimony with regard to the effect of laws, having to do with those pursuits, if of no more value than that of a robber touching some criminal enactment.

This frame of mind is well illustrated by the action of the majority of the present Ways and Means Committee, who, while formulating a new tariff, have persistently refused to hear the testimony of manufacturers and merchants as to its effect upon the business prosperity of the country. It is as if, in devising a law to regulate the jurisdiction of a court, the testimony of legal experts were excluded on the ground that it was ex parte and untrustworthy.

WALTER H. MCDANIELS.

LOWELL, Mass.

COAL.

I am asked: "What would be the probable effect on the industry you represent, and on your workmen's wages, of any measures passed in the line of President Cleveland's message?"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This country's coal industry, as a whole, needs no *direct* protection fron foreign coal, even be that coal free-freighted, as ballast, to our shores.

In my opinion a revised tariff may safely omit any duty on coal, provided the duty on American coal exported to Canada shall soon thereafter be abolished.

In this we should gain much more than we should lose. Canada, in many places, is burning wood, which American coal would displace but for the Canadian duty on our coal. Freed from this duty, our coal will penetrate further down the River St. Lawrence, in competition with coal from Nova Scotia, than it is now able to do.

But, coal is the mainspring which drives the wheels of manufacture and of commerce. Our manufactures were built up under the shelter of a tariff, not for revenue only, but also for protection. Any unfriendly or unwise tampering with that tariff, resulting in reducing that protection below the point necessary in order that American capital and American labor may stand against competition from the starvation labor of Europe, cannot but react hurtfully on our coal industry, reducing both the wages of our workmen and the output of our coal.

Let the tariff be revised, but let it be done only by hands *known* to be friendly to protection of American industries. Common interest so demands.

The President's recent proposition touching this revision has already produced widespread distrust, and has exerted a baneful influence on our industries: not because the people are unwilling that revision be made, but because they fear that revision if made by unfriendly hands.

They are willing that all excessive protection, which results in only unusual and unfair profits to capital, and which thus unnecessarily taxes productive labor, shall be pruned away.

They want only such protection left as shall prevent our citizen workmen from being forced to the wage level of Europe.

The condition of our industries to-day renders unwise any unnecessary experiment. To illustrate, let two circles, the larger enclosing the smaller, represent the case, the larger circle representing the total number of our workmen, the smaller circle representing the number of those workmen employed, and the space between the lines of the two circles representing the unemployed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The employed are the producers, and upon them is the whole burden of the community. The unemployed are a tax upon those producers. Anything which tends to reduce the circumference of the smaller circle will increase the space between the circles. Unwise tampering with the laws under which our industries have grown and thrived will decrease the size of the inner circle, and thus increase the burden upon the producing labor. Again, let two similar circles represent the respective ratio of total workmen and total employed workmen in Europe, changing only the relative sizes of these circles so that the space between their lines shall be much larger than that between those representing the American situation. Then unwise reductions in our tariff will extend the circle of European employed workmen just in proportion as it reduces the circle of the employed in America, thus transferring part of the burden from the employed in Europe to the employed in America, and the logical conclusion of this line of action must be either to force our wage level down to that of Europe, or to bring about a situation represented by an exchange of the circles representing the relative situation in the two countries, giving to us the two circles showing the greatest space between their lines. When these exchanged circles shall represent the then true situation of affairs, a necessity will have arisen for American statecraft, following European practice, to form a standing army, from the unemployed, taxing the disproportionate ranks of the producers for its support, as a lesser evil than to subject those producers to the viciousness consequent from the largely excessive numbers of the unemployed. Europe is in this condition to-day. Is it wisdom on our part to experiment toward that condition? Patriotism seems to demand that our citizens should cheerfully bear so light an individual tax as that resultant from our present tariff laws, when of that aggregate tax so large a portion is distributed to our citizen workmen, enabling them to rear and educate their sons to the level demanded by American citizenship, and to fit their daughters for wifehood and motherhood, instead of, as in Europe, sending them immature to do manual labor in the mines and fields.

Let us, as citizens of a great country, instinct with patriotic feelings, give competition free play among ourselves, and thus, while cheapening productive cost, retain the yearly increment of wealth, but let not our lawgivers force us into competition with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the foreign laborer within whose breast long continued want and squalor have doubtless left but little room for feelings patriotic.

WM. P. DE ARMIT.

PITTSBURGH, Pa.

PAPER.

It is asked how the paper industry would be affected if President Cleveland's tariff views became the policy of the Government.

The consumption of paper in this country exceeds, per capita, that of any other nation: indisputable evidence of the superior condition and general prosperity of the American people; and forcibly illustrating the effects of the present protective tariff policy of the country.

Although the average rate of duty on all manufactured goods exceeds 40 per cent., the present duty on unsized printing paper, which is much the larger part of the paper product of the country, has been reduced to 15 per cent. Several dutiable articles—caustic soda, soda ash, alum, ultramarine, aniline dyes, woolen felts, brass wire, and wood pulp—are, in a sense, the raw material for paper making. Most of these articles pay a much higher rate of duty than is levied on paper, yet, they being *distinctive manufactures*, American as well as foreign, the paper manufacturers ask no change in duties, believing that such change would check, if not annihilate, the American manufacture and consequently destroy the competition now going on between the manufactures of all countries. All these manufactures are of recent establishment in this country, and they have wrought a wonderful change in the cost of their respective productions, and could not survive free trade and maintain the present standard of wages paid by them. Further, paper makers, as a class, recognize that there is in this system a *principle* as well as a *policy*, and honor it by according to other industries that protection which they ask for themselves.

The wages paid in any branch of the paper industry in America are more than double those paid in any other country.

The price of common "newspaper" in 1860 was fully 9 cents per pound; it rose during the war to 28 cents, and is now sold at 4¼ to 4½ cents per pound. The consumer of paper has certainly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no occasion to complain. In what other industry has there been such a marked reduction in price?

A general depression in other industries would directly and quickly affect the paper trade. The very general use of paper in newspapers and books could, and would, be curtailed by the lessening of the purchasing power of labor, or by the non-employment of men, a condition certain to follow the throwing wider open our markets to the products of other nations, wrought with cheap labor.

The cry for free trade, or the demand that all the *protective* features shall be eliminated from the tariff, is the voice of the *few*, with whom I have not time to deal in this brief article.

Laws, both human and divine, are instituted and maintained for the purpose of affording the greatest good to the greatest number. The present American tariff system, so well grounded and so thoroughly tested, and so beneficent in its results to the *many*, should not, and, I predict, will not, be overthrown, though tangled in American politics and vigorously assaulted from abroad.

LAWRENCE, Mass. WM. A. RUSSELL.

PLATE GLASS.

Our industry, the manufacture of plate glass, is a peculiar one. The capital required is large, the process of manufacture exceptionally hazardous and the skill demanded very great. Every attempt to manufacture plate glass in America was a failure, resulting in financial disaster and ruin to the undertakers, until we took hold of it at this place. In fact every dollar (aggregating millions) invested in it before 1879 was lost.

My father was a retired banker, worth several millions. Persuaded by friends, he invested $200,000 in this business. The company borrowed freely from his banks, until in 1872, finding $500,000 of his money involved, he left his retirement and took personal charge of the works, putting in nearly a million dollars more.

In 1879, when the business first reached a paying basis, his actual losses were $619,790.40. Since then we have not made up this loss, without counting interest. If the money put into this business had been invested in Government bonds, and the interest re-invested, his estate would have been half a million dollars

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

larger, and his life probably prolonged for years—for he died from overwork.

It is therefore patent that the profits cannot meet the reduction. If it comes, we must either stop our works or our labor must stand it. Seventy-five per cent, of the cost of production is labor. Our skilled workmen average $17.04 per week, against $7.05 in England, $6.34 in France and $6.60 in Belgium.

The only labor we have *ever* imported was skilled men, whose knowledge was necessary to start the new industry. In Europe, father, mother and children were barely able by their united earnings to keep body and soul together. Our men earn enough to support their families and educate their children.

Before we made plate glass, the foreigner, having a monopoly, charged exorbitant prices. The records of the Treasury Department show that the average cost of large unsilvered plate glass imported in 1875 (our first year of active competition) was $97\frac{9}{10}$ cents per square foot, while in 1887 the average was $32\frac{7}{10}$ cents, a reduction of $66\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. Silvered plate glass averaged in 1875 $1.26 per square foot, in 1887 it averaged 1.09\frac{7}{10}$ per square foot, a reduction of $12\frac{3}{10}$ per cent. Why is the reduction in one five times larger than the other? Solely because unsilvered plate is made in America, while silvered plate is not, and higher prices are exacted and will be forever, unless the present tariff is maintained until factories can be established. A plate of glass costing $105 when our works were established sells to-day for $31.50, and, bear in mind that no part of this great reduction is due either to improved methods or improved machinery, but *solely* to sharp competition of American manufacturers.

Americans can do what any people can, but they cannot in fifteen years reach the same condition that France attained under an absolutely prohibitory tariff in two hundred years and England reached under a tariff eight to twelve times as large as ours in one hundred and sixty years.

I have faith to believe that, when we are old enough to have full crews of Americans, their "genius" will make improvements and discoveries that will revolutionize our business and enable us to compete on equal grounds with foreign makers and still pay living wages, but that day has not yet come.

N. T. De Pauw.

New Albany, Ind.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUGAR CULTURE.

The abolition of the duty on sugar would mean the entire annihilation of the Louisiana sugar industry. The sugar fields would be abandoned to weeds and willows, and the machinery of the costly factories rendered valueless, except as scrap iron. A considerable reduction of the duty, say 50 per cent., would have about the same effect as its entire repeal, although the abandonment of sugar culture would be more gradual in the former than in the latter event.

About one-half the capital and one-half the population of the State of Louisiana are employed in sugar culture. The extinction of this industry would result in the gradual forced emigration of the great majority of the laborers engaged in this branch of agriculture. Were it possible, and it is not, to substitute any other crop for that of sugar, there is no other that will support so large a population on a given area of land.

The sugar crop last year sold for more than $20,000,000, the most of which was distributed through the channels of interstate commerce. The destruction of capital consequent upon a repeal of the sugar duties would not only involve merchants, planters, and laborers in a common ruin, but the loss of the sugar industry would be a national calamity.

If called upon to bear a share in any general sacrifice for the public welfare, the Louisiana planters might be willing, and possibly able, to stand a reduction of ten per cent., if assured of future stability.

While any reduction would have an injurious effect, the instability of the present tariff is far more serious in its consequences than would be a slight reduction of duty.

To keep up with the scientific development of the sugar industry abroad, new and expensive machinery is required by the planters; but it is considered unsafe to invest any large amounts of capital in this manner under the annual and the existing menace of unfavorable tariff legislation.

Taking bad and good years together, the sugar industry has made steady, if not rapid, progress, the crop of last year having been exceeded by only six ante-bellum crops. The product for ten years, from 1865 to 1874, was 490,000 tons; for a like period,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from 1875 to 1884, 1,030,000 tons, an increase of more than 100 per cent. Progress is now more marked than ever, and but for the agitation in Congress, the prospects of the sugar industry were never brighter.

The question of wages depends of course upon whether the industry advances or retrogrades. With adequate and stable protection the production of sugar in Louisiana will largely increase from year to year, and the consequent demand for labor will insure even better wages than are now paid. On the other hand, if the duty be so reduced as to lead to the partial abandonment of cane culture, a reduction of wages would undoubtedly follow an excessive supply of labor and lower prices for sugar.

With such wages as free American laborers command it is impossible without tariff protection to compete with the beet sugar produced under bounties by the cheap labor of Europe, and with South American, West Indian, East Indian and Hawaiian cane sugars grown by coolie or other semi-slave labor.

LOUIS BUSH.

NEW ORLEANS, La.

SOUTHERN INTERESTS.

Radical changes in our national tariff laws would affect the people of Florida less directly, but not less sensibly, than they would the people of the Northern States. Florida has few protected industries of present importance, orange-growing and lumber manufacture being chief; but she is, nevertheless, much concerned in the maintenance of Protection. We are told by Southern revenue reformers that the tariff has made the North rich and prosperous, but has not benefitted the South. What is said of the North we believe to be true; what is asserted of the South is nearly true of Florida, if we consider only the tariff's direct effects, but not otherwise. Florida, until of late, was always poor—poor under revenue tariffs and under Protection—and she might have remained forever poor except for that very prosperity at the North which, having developed the great West, turned its bounty upon us and gave to Florida, the earliest discovered and longest settled, her first start in the world. Florida's recent growth is due directly to that prosperity which Protection

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has built up in the North. Eight years ago a Pennsylvania manufacturer redeemed Florida's public domain from pawn, receiving for his million thus devoted a tract of overflowed land; with other hundreds of thousands he drained a great area of it, planted a thousand acres of sugar-cane, bought improved machinery, and is, to-day, harvesting his first crop. The district, when drained, will contain several million acres of richest sugar lands, one-half of which will belong to the State. If the sugar tariff is spared, Florida will yet produce, as prophesied by ex-President Grant, in 1880, "the one hundred million pounds of sugar now imported." The release of our public domain gave us railways—nearly fifteen hundred miles of new track since 1881; railways have brought immigration, developed new industries, established trade, given us splendid hotels and tens of thousands of winter tourists, all from the same prosperous North. And we have yet other undeveloped industries, one, at least, as great as all we may expect of sugar; I refer to the possibilities of our native fibre plants. As Florida's start in life is due to Northern prosperity, so is her future dependent upon its continuance. Hard times at the North means for us scarcity of money, high rates of interest, railway and other building stopped, no market for fruits and winter vegetables, no tourists, and ten thousand tramps. We see no benefit to us in a transfer of prosperity from Northern manufacturers to Northern importers; the manufacturer keeps the money at home where we can borrow of it; the importer sends it abroad. We are not convinced by arguments about the tax on necessities; where the mean temperature of winter rarely falls below fifty degrees Fahrenheit the price of woollens is not a burning issue. We are not moved by the revival-of-foreign-commerce plea. It is paying best to develop our internal resources. If our country, like the British empire, were in pieces, separated by leagues of sea, we, too, should need ships, but we are in one piece, and in railways we have outstripped all the rest of the world. While New York harbor is ready for foreign commerce, Florida harbors are not. In New York's far-seeing economy appropriations for Southern harbors have been always "swindles" and "steals," reserved for New York press denunciations and the vetoes of tariff-reducing presidents.

JOHN P. VARNUM.

JACKSONVILLE, Fla.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOR MARKET.

"What would be the effect on workmen's wages in this country, of any measures passed in accordance with the recommendations of President Cleveland's message, in regard to reduction of revenue by taking the amount necessary off from our present tariff?"

In answer to this question, I would say most unhesitatingly that it would do one of two things: either have the effect, in many branches of our manufactures, of forcing a reduction in the price of labor from ten to thirty per cent.; or would force the wage earners employed in these occupations into other fields of labor not so immediately and directly affected by the operations of a protective tariff; and as those fields of labor are now supplied to meet the demand for our present population, such transfer would not be made to any extent, and therefore it must of necessity take the course of reduction of wages in this country, approximately to the scale of wages paid the same kind of labor in Europe, and the reasons are very plain:

Steam and electricity have in the past few years changed all the currents of trade with foreign countries. Quick, certain and cheap transportation on the ocean, has so changed the conditions of trade, that the slightest vibration in prices or of the conditions of the law of supply and demand, or of the cost of product, is at once felt all over this country as well as Europe.

A difference of even 5 per cent. in the cost of production of any given article of manufacture, will either retain the orders for production in this country, or it will transfer them to European manufacturers. This being the fact (as every dealer knows) it will immediately bring the price of labor in this country in competition with the labor of Europe, and this state of things will not take, as in old times, a long time to accomplish, but will be immediate and complete, just so soon as the laws go into effect that create this state of affairs.

Then what is the inevitable result? The labor market in this country (and I am glad that it is so) resists reduction in the price of labor—and the result must of necessity be, that the orders for many goods now manufactured in this country must and will go to foreign manufacturers; our mills will reduce their output or stop entirely, and the raw products now manufactured in this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country will be transported in foreign ships (for we have none to speak of) and be returned to us in a manufactured state. Our labor market would be over-supplied; discontent, murmurs and suffering would ensue, *but finally the wage earner must accept a rate of wages that is nearly on the plane of the European laborer.*

This result will come not alone to operatives in our manufacturing industries, but also to the thousand and one industries wholly dependent upon increase of population and upon the rate of wages received by the mass of operatives. Therefore, the inevitable and only result that can come to the wage earners of this country, if President Cleveland's recommendations go into effect, is a reduction of wages.

NEW YORK. H. K. THURBER.

AGRICULTURE.

The President, if I understand him, proposes to reduce the tariff on manufactured commodities, under the pretence of rendering them more cheap to the consumers. In my judgment this would be a great injury to the agricultural industry of the country. A reduction of duties must result in one of two things: in reducing the wages of our laboring people, or else transferring a large portion of the manufacturing industry of this country to Europe. Either of these would result in injury to our people generally, to none more than the farmers. The agricultural products of the country, outside of tobacco and cotton, probably amount yearly to $3,500,000,000. Of this product about 92 per cent. is consumed by our own people, and only about eight per cent. exported. Our work people, taking one industry with another, are paid double the amount of wages that are paid to the work people of Europe for performing the same amount of labor there; and are therefore better fed, better clothed, better housed, and better educated than the work people of any country in the world; have not only the necessaries, but many of the luxuries of life as well, and in consequence consume more of the manufactured commodities and eat more of the agricultural products, per capita, than any people elsewhere on the globe; for the purchasing capacity of a dollar here is as great as it is in Europe. Now, the power or ability of the workingman to buy, whether it be clothes for the body or food to eat, depends on the wages he receives. Take from him any part of the wages he now

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

earns, whether by a reduction or the transfer of the business to Europe, and you lessen his power to buy either agricultural products or manufactured commodities to the extent of the wages he loses, and this will affect agriculture as well as all the other industries of the country.

Anything that injures the home market injures the farmer, for the home market is his main dependence for the sale of his surplus products, and it is out of these that he lives; it is from these that he clothes himself and family and provides the necessaries of life.

No civilized nation has ever been prosperous or great without a diversity of human industries; and the more numerous the industries the more people will be employed and the larger the wages paid. When the people are employed they earn wages, and the more wages they earn the more goods and provisions they can buy.

There is still another phase of this question: when you transfer any of the industries to Europe, either in whole or in part, to the extent that you do it, you throw our people out of employment, and it becomes necessary for them to seek some other occupation. Many of these from necessity would be driven into agriculture, and in this way they would become producers rather than consumers of agricultural products, thereby increasing our surplus of agricultural products, and making it more difficult for the farmer to sell at remunerative prices. Therefore a reduction of the tariff as now proposed would be a source of great injury to the farmers as well as the working people of the country.

THOMAS H. DUDLEY.

CAMDEN, N. J.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

THE ELEVENTH COMMANDMENT.

In this very pleasant world you may look upon men in either of two ways. At the outset you must make your selection. Your choice will, in part, reveal yourself. It will also determine your happiness and success. You are here with us. You must remain awhile. And you must shape yourself upon one theory or the other. You may say: Resolved, That all men are Ishmaelites. Or you may pause and reflect. You may give such a conclusion the consideration it deserves. You may dignify it with its proper importance. Then, perhaps, you may say: Resolved, That all men are brothers. It is a matter of no concern to "all men" which resolution you adopt; but it concerns you very greatly. It will make a big difference in your history.

Did it ever occur to you what a profound lesson was taught in that horn-book story where your attention was called to the fact that "Mary loved the lamb, you know."

Now that you are a grown child, it is taught you again, in the statement "He first loved us."

There is a new religion now growing in this world. Or, if you prefer, there is an old religion, *up to which* this world is now growing.

The most hopeful sign of these times is that this new-old religion is finding congenial soil. Just in proportion as it is generative, will this world be a pleasanter place in which to live.

The ten old commandments are good. But the eleventh commandment is the best. "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another." It is the delightful religion of the universal brotherhood of men. I had rather lay one stone in the foundation of its temple than to have the ownership of the world, during my brief stay here.

It means universal charity. Charity of thought. Charity of feeling. Charity of judgment. It means the actual and practical relief of suffering. It means largeness of sympathy. It means respect for the feelings and sensibilities of others. It means humanity, in its broadest and most comprehensive sense. It means the cultivation of that most lovable habit—the habit of unselfishness.

There are no "professors" of this grand religion.

You either practice it, or you enjoy none of its manifold blessings.

WALTER GREGORY.

II.

TAXING LAND VALUES.

As the "Georgeism Making the Rich Richer" in your February number is certainly not Henry Georgeism, it is unlikely that Mr. George will feel called upon to answer Mr. Adams's question.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If taxes on the property instanced by Mr. Adams valued at $40,000 (lot, $10,000; building, $30,000) were entirely removed from the building and assessed only on the lot, the owner would obviously be relieved of three-quarters of his burden, provided the rate of taxation remained the same.

But Mr. George proposes to increase the rate on city land until all of the net income which it produces to its owner is absorbed, leaving him, however, free to exact and keep, clear of taxation, as much rent for his buildings as the law of supply and demand will permit.

As, ignoring extreme cases, a net income of from four to seven per cent. is derived from city land, that would be the rate of taxation under Mr. George's plan.

Now a four to seven per cent. tax on that $10,000 lot would probably yield as large a sum as is derived from building and lot combined under our present system.

The real estate Crœsus of Mr. Adams's imagination has one-quarter of his property in land and three-quarters in buildings. It is more likely that the real Crœsus has one-half in land, taking into consideration the vacant lots he is pictured in Mr. George's writings as "holding for a rise."

Now the larger the value of his land, as compared with his buildings, the heavier would the George tax fall upon him; hence, Mr. Adams's anxiety lest the land Crœsus escape his share of taxation under the George plan is needless.

A. E. COTTIER.

III.

THE SUFFRAGE PARADOX.

OF late years there has been a growing suspicion among thoughtful Americans that there is something the matter with universal suffrage. We have always heard that our government is a government of the people, that it is founded upon universal suffrage, and that it is the best government that the world has ever seen. Hence it seems to follow that universal suffrage must be right. We may differ according to our party affiliations as to what candidate ought to be counted in after the people have exercised their right of suffrage, but we all agreed that we could not have popular government without universal suffrage. And yet when a property owner finds that as a result of universal suffrage his property has been confiscated by taxation, or when a creditor finds that universal suffrage has enabled his debtors to cheat him by paying their debts in debased currency, he begins to fear that there may be something in the practical working of universal suffrage which is not quite right; and, if he is a very bold man, he may ask himself in the secrecy of his back bedroom, with the doors and windows tightly shut, whether after all suffrage should not be restricted to men who can read and write or who own taxable property.

Before making any effort to modify our present system of universal suffrage, we ought surely fully to comprehend its relation to popular government. It may seem a rash assertion, but it is nevertheless true that as a nation we have no clear idea of what constitutes popular government, and therefore cannot properly undertand the relation that universal suffrage bears to it. We are accustomed loosely to define popular government as a government of the people, and to assume that the people govern through the medium of universal suffrage. So far is this from the truth that no government which rests upon universal suffrage can possibly be a government of the people. It is a government of a part of the people, and bears the closest possible resemblance to an oligarchy. An oligarchy is a government of the few, or the minority; a government based on universal suffrage is a government of the majority. Where forty-nine per cent. of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people govern there is an oligarchy; where fifty-one per cent. govern there is the sort of popular government which results from universal suffrage. The two are separated by a space so narrow as to be scarcely visible.

The American government is purely a government of the majority. In practice it is, of course, modified by means of returning boards; but in theory, the majority rule absolutely. The wishes of the minority are not of the slightest consequence, unless there is an attempt to assert them by revolution. We established universal suffrage expressly in order that the majority should rule. We allow the minority to vote, but it is with the full understanding that their votes are powerless. What right have we, then, to call our government a popular government? The very fact that it is based upon universal suffrage proves that it is not a popular government. It is a government of fifty-one per cent. of the voting population, and it differs from a loathsome oligarchy only by two per cent. Nevertheless, such is the strange influence of the word "universal" upon the American mind that it is the almost unanimous belief among our people that a government based on universal suffrage must be a government of the whole people.

When we have once arrived at the truth concerning the nature of our government, and the relation between it and universal sufferage, we can proceed to discuss the desirability of substituting limited for universal suffrage. As it is an axiom that our government is the best government the world ever saw, whatever changes we make should be in harmony with our governmental system. The change which most naturally suggests itself would be to relieve the minority of the useless labor of voting. There is an enormous amount of nervous and muscular force annually wasted by the minority in deciding for whom to vote, and in going to the polls. It has been estimated by an eminent mathematician that this force thus utterly wasted would be sufficient, if converted into units of work, to raise a weight of many thousand pounds several inches above the surface of the earth—a result which, as all scientific persons know, would be of incalculable service to the hungry and wretched millions of our race. Why should this force be thrown completely away? It is idle to say that the minority has always hitherto voted, and should, therefore, continue to vote, or that their voting has some mysterious symbolic significance. These are the arguments by which the pompous ceremonies of the effete monarchies are defended. They are unworthy of a free and progressive country. We should discard everything that is meaningless and useless, and there is nothing which is quite so useless as the impotent ballots of a minority.

It may be asked how can we distinguish the majority from the minority except by the test of the polls. Nothing could be simpler. Who constitute the majority in every nation,—the ignorant or the intelligent? Unquestionably the intelligent are the minority and those who are ignorant are the majority. We have here an infallible test by which we can ascertain what citizens belong to the majority, which has the sole right to rule, and what citizens belong to the minority, and should therefore be spared the mockery of voting. If the intelligent minority fancy that their votes ever have the slightest influence on a successful election, they are the victims of a delusion which they should hasten to end.

If we honestly wish to carry out consistently and with the least labor the theory that the majority should rule, the theory on which our whole structure of government is built, we must limit the privilege of voting not to property owners, or to men who can read the Federal Constitution, but to men of undoubted ignorance. No person should be allowed to vote who cannot prove that he is unable to read or write, or who, in case he unfortunately lacks that qualification, cannot give satisfactory evidence of his belief that the government can make a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dollar out of paper or out of seventy-odd cents worth of silver. Men possessing these qualifications belong indisputably to the majority, and if we confine the privilege of voting exclusively to them we carry out the theory of our government and cut off that meaningless excrescence, the voting of the minority.

This, then, is the change which should be made if we wish to be be consistent upholders of universal suffrage. The more earnestly we believe in universal suffrage, the more earnestly we ought to try to limit the exercise of suffrage to the ignorant. This may seem a paradox, but it is a great political truth. We have built our government on the broad principle that the ignorant shall rule the intelligent. Let us show ourselves consistent by relieving the intelligent of the fruitless burden of voting.

W. L. ALDEN.

IV.

HALLS FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS.

IT is eminently desirable that in every city there should be one great hall capable of holding such numbers of citizens as usually attend out-of-door assemblies, and that the cost of hiring of such hall should be moderate. But moderate cost is a thing unattainable if the hall be reserved for public meetings only ; it must be employed for other purposes. Now every considerable city needs a commercial exchange of one kind or another—some great centre for the transaction of business on a large scale. So too every city needs a theatre, concert-hall, or what not. If one public hall could be used for these several purposes, its hire one evening for a public meeting, a theatrical exhibition, an operatic performance, etc., need not cost, as it does now, as much as will pay for many days the interest on the capital invested in its construction. Probably no great public hall in any of our cities is ever used, on the average, oftener than three nights in a week. Thus three nights a week must pay the expenses of the building during seven days and nights. But let one of the "exchanges" (or more than one) occupy the hall daily during business hours—10 to 3. Then let it be used for lectures, theatrical exhibitions, public meetings during the evenings, and on Sundays morning and evening for religious meetings or sacred concerts or lectures, and the burden of expense to be borne by each of these part-tenants, will be comparatively light. Of course the project is not free from problems and difficulties, but a competent architect may be trusted to meet these and to overcome them, planning an interior that will serve equally well for all purposes. After the architect has done his part, Yankee ingenuity will provide a way of transforming almost instantaneously the "bear garden" of the exchange into the theatre auditorium, or into the place of religious assembly. The certainty of adequate income from a structure of this kind would justify the most liberal expenditure for an absolutely fire-proof building.

J. F. G. JAMESON.

V.

"COMMUNISM AND PROTECTION."

THE February edition of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW published an article entitled "Communism and Protection," by W. M. Fishback, in which the following extraordinary conjunction was made:

"Communism, Socialism, *Henry Georgeism*, and all that family of dogmas, have . . . one common essential principle : That it is the right and duty of Government to seize, by law, the fruits of the labor of one man and divide them with others."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is a difficult undertaking to dispel the dense popular ignorance on any economic problem, but when this has linked with it deliberate misrepresentation the task is herculean.

The assertion that "Henry Georgeism" aims at the taking of the fruits of one man's labor and transferring them to others is, to say the least, laughable, since its purpose is to defend that very right. Mr. George states his position clearly in "Progress and Poverty," Chap. I., Book VII.: "As a man belongs to himself, so his labor when put in concrete form belongs to him. And for this reason, that which a man makes or produces is his own, as against all the world—to enjoy or to destroy, to use, to exchange, or to give. No one else can rightfully claim it, and his exclusive right to it involves no wrong to any one else."

Taking part of the product of a man's labor as rent for the mere privilege of using the natural bounties, is a negation of this proposition, and, therefore, Mr. George maintains that it is unjust. And Mr. George is not alone in this position. Dugald Stewart, in his "Philosophy of the Active and Moral Powers of Man," which work was accepted as a text-book for Yale College in the 50's and 60's, and perhaps is used yet, says, Sec. III., Art. 1: "The right of property. The following observations on the *right of property* are introduced here chiefly with a view to show that men possess rights antecedent to the establishment of the political union. It cannot, I apprehend, be doubted that, according to the notions to which we, in the present state of society, are habituated from our infancy, the three following things are included in the idea of property: 1. A right of exclusive enjoyment. 2. A right of inquiry after our property, when taken away without our consent, and of reclaiming it wherever found. 3. A right of transference. We do not consider our property in any object to be complete unless we can exercise all these three rights with respect to it.

"Let us suppose, then, a country so fertile as to produce all the necessaries and accommodations of life, without any exertions of human industry; it is manifest that, in such a state of things, no man would think of appropriating to himself any of these necessaries or accommodations, any more than we, in this part of the globe, think of appropriating air or water. As this, however, is not, in any part of the earth, the condition of man—doomed, as he is, by the circumstances of his birth, to eat his bread in the sweat of his brow—it would be reasonable, *a priori*, that Nature would make some provision for securing to individuals the fruits of their industry. In fact, she *has* made such a provision in the natural sentiment of mankind, which leads them to consider industry as entitled to reward, and, in particular, the laborer as entitled to the fruit of his own labor. These, I think, may be fairly stated as *moral axioms* to which the mind yields its assent as immediately and necessarily as it does to any axiom in mathematics or metaphysics.

"This sentiment, that 'the laborer deserves the fruit of his own labor,' is the *chief*, or rather (abstracting positive institution), the *only* foundation of the sense of property. An attempt to deprive him of it is a species of *injustice* which rouses the indignation of every impartial spectator.

"In order to think with accuracy on this subject, it is necessary to distinguish carefully the *complete* right of property which is founded on *labor*, from the *transient* right of possession which is acquired by mere *priority* of *occupancy*."

The general conclusions which I deduce from the foregoing observations are these:

1. That, in every state of society, *labor*, wherever it is exerted, is understood to found a right of property.

2. That, according to natural law, labor is the *only* original way of acquiring property.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. That, according to natural law, mere *occupancy* founds only a *right of possession*, and that, wherever it founds a complete *right of property*, it owes its force to *positive institutions*.

BENJ. DOBLIN.

VI.

THE HOLIDAY HALLUCINATION.

AMERICANS in former times were much accused of being too serious, and of taking their few vacations and their pleasures grimly and sadly. Very often they were compared to their disadvantage with the people of other nations, who had frequent holidays, and who have the art, which we were charged with lacking, of thoroughly knowing how to enjoy themselves. This general complaint was a favorite editorial topic twenty years ago. It was a part of the argument to refer then to the continent of Europe for proof of a superior gayety and more natural expression of joy, and to England itself where sports are nationalized and made institutions, and where even the august Parliament adjourns for participation in the pleasures of a horserace. The traditions of a strait-laced Puritanism, and the fierce struggle engendered by the hurry and hunger of money-getting, to say nothing of the extra "go" given us by our climate, were adduced to account for this renunciation of pleasure. No end was there of homilies read to us on these solemn habits of ours, which were supposed to make us a thin-faced and nervous race, when compared with the plump, ruddy Englishman, from whose ancestors our New England stock descended.

But since the close of the Civil War there has been a great change in our work-day time. The old holidays have not only been more formally observed, but many new holidays have now been added and legally enforced. The better observance of Christmas and New Years has not only been marked by all classes, but the half of December in our large cities and towns gives many people a vacation, and turns nearly every business aside or makes a multitude of businesses put on a holiday costume, and cater directly to the long holiday trade. Not only so, but the political deference now so universally paid to labor and the laborer, has in this State created a weekly half-holiday, the influence and observance of which have not stopped with the boundaries of New York. It will certainly surprise the reader, who has not paused to think of it, to be told exactly what a subtraction has been lately made by the holiday rage from our real working time. If it is to remain, and is to have any influence on the health and happiness of the community, we ought soon to be the highest spirited and most rested people on the face of the earth, where barbarism and oriental ease do not make the exception.

If we add to our fifty-two Sundays the twenty-six half Saturdays, and to these New Years, Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, the Fourth of July, Labor Day, Thanksgiving and Christmas, we find that eighty-five days of our calendar are consecrated to the suspension of toil. This is nearly *three months of time;* and, if we should add to this holiday or recreation period, Good Friday, and other similarly half-observed days, and the election days, on some of which banks and public exchanges are regularly closed, we shall see that a *full quarter of the year* is now practically made unproductive time. What effect all this, together with the influence of the eight-hour law where it exists by statute, is to have on wages and prices eventually, it is perhaps too early to tell. But it must have some; and, the positive detriment which much of our business suffers from the fact that the loss of the half of Saturday amounts, in effect, to serious destruction of the remaining half (particularly with banks and the money and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

business exchanges) may well suggest the inquiry whether it is not nearly time to call a halt in this effort to promote national joy and to cure the old-time Puritan sadness.

The impression that an end to this holiday-making should come is not, however, shared by all, for there are several days yet left that are candidates for holiday distinction. In the New York Legislature a bill has lately been introduced to make Lincoln's birthday a legal day of rest. In one of our leading magazines the day of the adoption of the national flag and the day of the ratification of the Constitution are named and urged as deserving the holiday badge, which will subtract a day each from June and September, if the hint is acted upon. To go still further, a large portion of the colored race and their friends think the anniversary of the signing of the emancipation proclamation ought to be separated from the ordinary days of toil and be legally observed.

It is possible that business and the more serious needs of the community can stand all this; but one is strongly reminded by this increasing holiday tendency of the man who taught his horse, after a considerable series of experiments, to go without eating. The scheme worked perfectly, until the last straw was taken away, when the inconsiderate animal one day, and without fully appreciating the merits of such a reform, suddenly gave up the ghost.

JOEL BENTON.

VII.

LAND NATIONALIZATION.

In considering the question of land nationalization, there always rises in my mind an objection which I must confess has caused me no little difficulty to meet. "God made the soil and man shall not monopolize what his own labor has not created," says the theorist; but would not this principle interdict private ownership in a calf? God made the calf as well as He did the land. The calf grows, and with its growth its value is enhanced, the calf costs its owner no more in proportion to bring up than it costs the land-owner to "bring up" his land; but still more than all this, if "labor of creation" determines ownership, would not the calf belong to the cow whose labor has brought it into the world?

The only "unearned increment" is the milk that rightfully belongs to the cow, and by due process of nature passes to her offspring, but of which the calf is frequently deprived by a harsh and untimely exit at the hands of the butcher. You say, perhaps, that this milk has been earned by the owner of the cow, that he has fed her on the produce of his fields. But if the land does not legally belong to him, neither does the produce of the land, and he has consequently fed his cow on the product of a theft.

This theory, namely that man shall not monopolize what he has not created, would rob the humblest Irishman of his pig too. He has paid for his pig, but the owner has paid for his land. The Irish gentleman feeds his pig, but the agriculturist feeds by expensive phosphates his ground, therefore, if the agriculturist hat no right to the soil the Irishman has no sole proprietorship in his pig, and the one might as properly be nationalized as the other. Land nationalization for Ireland would be to place the control of her land more stringently in the hands of the hated British than it is at present. Land nationalization in America would be to turn every yeoman into a "tenant at will" of the occupant of the White House.

Land nationalization, in short, is the earliest conception of feudalism, and for the nineteenth century to go back to that is a singular instance of a dog returning to his—well to what that dog has already in his wisdom discarded.

LLOYD S. BRYCE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

I.

A CONTRIBUTION TO CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY.

The study of an interesting fragment of American history* was suggested to its author by the lack of any authoritative and connected account of the subject which was so closely associated with the early history of the Constitution. The newspapers of the day; the letters and manuscripts of leaders of the movement against the Alien and Sedition laws; and especially the letters and papers of John Breckenridge, form the basis of this clear and, in the main, impartial narrative of the famous Resolutions. The history goes back to the passage of the "Alien and Sedition Act," by which Congress delegated to the President the power to banish from the country, at his discretion, alien friends, and, in case of resistance, to imprison and deprive them of the right to become citizens. Alien enemies were subject to banishment and imprisonment by the same authority. The Sedition Act, as first presented to Congress, declared France a public enemy, and prescribed capital punishment to those citizens who should give aid or comfort to Frenchmen, although France was not then in a state of declared war. These clauses at once created great excitement, and were stricken out before the passage of the bill, and the last sections only, referring to seditious practices and the publication of seditious libels on the Government and its officers, were submitted and passed by both Houses. They were modified to permit the truth to be set up as a defense in action for libel, and to limit the continuance of the act to the period of one administration. In a letter from Mr. Jefferson, then Vice-President, this comment is found: "The Alien and Sedition laws are working hard. I fancy that some of the State legislatures will take strong ground on this occasion. For my own part, I consider those laws as only an experiment on the American mind to see how far it will bear an avowed violation of the Constitution. If this goes down, we shall immediately see attempted another act of Congress declaring that the President shall continue in office during life, reserving to another occasion, the transfer of the succession to his heirs and the establishment of the Senate for life. . . . That these things are in contemplation I have no doubt; nor can I be confident of their failure after the dupery of which our countrymen have shown themselves susceptible."

The resolutions were passed by the Kentucky Legislature as a protest against this encroachment on State rights, and distinctly stated that Congress had violated that amendment to the Constitution by which it was declared that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by

* "The Kentucky Resolutions of 1798." An Historical Study. By Ethelbert Dudley Warfield, A.M., LL.B. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Also, that clause of the Constitution which asserts "that the migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year 1808." A similar series of resolutions, written by Mr. Madison, were passed by the legislature of Virginia at a later day.

The authorship of the Kentucky resolutions has been a matter of discussion, though not for many years following their production was Mr. Breckenridge's claim disputed. Mr. Warfield asserts that the document was prepared by Mr. Breckenridge, after a consultation with Jefferson and Col. W. C. Nicholas, from a draught which Jefferson had drawn up by request, the draught being embodied in part only, and with many modifications by Mr. Breckenridge, who claimed, and during his lifetime always received, the honor of being their author.

The volume is a valuable contribution to the constitutional history of our country.

II.

NAPOLEON AND THE RUSSIAN CAMPAIGN.

THE picture of Napoleon Bonaparte which Count Tolstoi draws in his review of the Russian campaign,* is several shades darker than any yet presented by his numerous biographers and critics. Very naturally, the Russian could not be expected to extol the conqueror of Moscow, but Tolstoi's reputation for love of justice and clearness of vision would lead the reader to anticipate an impartial, unpartisan estimate of a man whose career attracts the attention of writers and readers even at this day. A careful inspection of this work of eighteen chapters, discovers no trace of the greatness usually ascribed to Napoleon, even by his enemies. Everything has been taken from him save his name and his existence. If this were the only volume which contained the record of that memorable winter in Russia, scarcely enough interest would be aroused in the reader's mind to induce him to follow the fortunes of the French Emperor to the closing chapter. It is difficult to recognize the hero of Jena and Austerlitz in the stultified, erratic, selfish, inconsequent, itinerant general, whose numerous errors in judgment are condoned by the wisdom of his subordinates, and whose brilliant strategic movements, at least we have always so considered them, are made to appear the result of a blind and immovable Fate which held him in its firm grasp and prevented anything like the exercise of individual judgment. For example, the orders for the battle of Borodino contained, we are told, the following: "The batteries established at the points chosen by Napoleon with the cannon of Pernety and Fouché, will place themselves in line, one hundred and two pieces in all, and, opening fire, will devastate the Russian outworks and redoubts."

Tolstoi asserts that this command was futile, because the station selected by Napoleon for the batteries was at such distance from the Russian entrenchments that no shots could possibly have reached them, and the one hundred and two cannon would have thundered in vain. The entire order is stigmatized as confused and useless, to any one who might dare to analyze its meaning, and of the four commands contained in it, not one was carried out. "The progress of the battle was not directed by Napoleon, for no part of his plan was carried out, and during the engagement he did not know what was going on before his eyes."

*"The Physiology of War. Napoleon and the Russian Campaign." By Count Leo Tolstoi. Translated from the third French edition, by Huntington Smith. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The author makes an inexcusably weak point when he asserts that it is paradoxical to claim that the battle of Borodino was the work of Napoleon, because *Napoleon did not kill anybody.* The soldiers did the killing, not by the emperor's orders, but acting from their own impulses. Had they been forbidden to fight they would have disobeyed orders, for to them a battle was necessary. From whatever standpoint this argument be viewed it is shallow. The same course of reasoning, applied to other military heroes, would almost invariably strip them of their glory. Moreover, the defenders of Napoleon have the right to assert, in face of this conclusion, that if the soldiers acted without, or contrary to, their general's orders, they, and not their leader, must be held responsible for the reckless loss of life and the terrible scenes of carnage which the Emperor is so generally accused of causing to gratify his own selfish ambition. Tolstoi allows that it *seemed to Napoleon* that his will was the mainspring of action, but this conclusion was but another proof of his fatuity. Again, no one was responsible for the burning of Moscow. The city burned "because it was in a condition when a city of wood must necessarily burn." In place of the careful proprietors of houses, it was occupied by an immense military force of strangers who smoked dangerous pipes and cooked their meals twice a day. A conflagration was, therefore, inevitable. The famous retreat, says this Russian critic, was managed as badly as it could possibly have been. No plan could have been invented whereby the French army would have been more speedily destroyed than that contrived by Napoleon. "To say that Napoleon led his army to destruction because he wished to destroy it, or because he was very stupid, would be as false and as unjust as it would be to say that Napoleon led his troops to Moscow because he wished to do so, and because he was a man of genius." His action simply coincided with the laws of the progress of events. When retreat was inevitable, this figurehead of the French army, for nowhere in these pages is he anything more, is represented as an obese, stupid, luxurious coward, who, elegantly attired in furs, safely ensconses himself in a comfortable traveling carriage, which he has caused to be well filled with Russian treasure, and, thinking only of his own safety, hastens as rapidly as possible towards his capital, where he receives the adulation of his people.

At no time in his career does he appear to be the master of his fortunes, nor does he display the most ordinary amount of common sense. He is the subject of a multitude of happy accidents. Fortuitous circumstances combine to load him with fame. "The stupidity of those about him, his own sincerity in falsehood, and his brilliant and presumptuous egotism, combined to push this man to the head of the army." Every action is received by its enthusiastic countrymen as heroic.

The conclusion which Count Tolstoi reaches is, that the final object of events or of historical personages is beyond the reach of man; at which point the reader is constrained to inquire, concerning the discussion through which he has come, *cui bono?* The work of the translator in this review, which will doubtless have a large circle of readers, has been very happily accomplished. The principal title seems to us much too general for such a very narrow piece of military history.

III.

HYPNOTISM AS A SCIENCE.

"ANIMAL MAGNETISM" is the latest volume in the International Scientific Series,* and is the product of the dual authorship of the Messrs. Alfred Binet and

* The International Scientific Series. "Animal Magnetism." By Alfred Binet and Charles Féré. D. Appleton & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Charles Feré, whose researches and publications on this and kindred themes have been sufficiently extensive to guarantee their fitness for the task here assigned them. The work does not claim to be a didactic treatise, the authors rightly judging that such an undertaking would be premature at the present stage of the development of the science. They present, however, a great variety of experiments, and of facts deduced from personal and careful observation, and furnish the reader with the latest results and conclusions concerning this line of study. Many of the experiments described were performed at the Salpêtrière (where M. Féré is an assistant physician), and were made in accordance with the methods of M. Charcot, the chief of the school of the Salpêtrière. Among the chapters which will attract most attention are those which describe the methods of producing hypnotism; its various forms; hypnotic hallucination; application of hypnotism to therapeutics, and a consideration of hypnotism and responsibility. The action of æsthesiogenic agents in producing hallucination is clearly shown by means of experiments. For instance, "After awaking one of our subjects, we showed her a Chinese gong and the pad with which it was sounded. The sight of the instrument alarmed her, and as soon as it was struck she fell into a state of catalepsy. After this preparatory experiment, she was awakened and requested to look attentively at the gong, and meanwhile a small magnet was brought close to her head. In the course of a minute she asserted that she could not see the instrument and that it had completely disappeared, and when the gong was sounded, more loudly than before, she did not fall into a state of catalepsy, but only looked at it with an air of some surprise. Hence it appears that the magnet, in some sense, paralysed the vision of the gong; the perception of this object was replaced by a corresponding anæsthesia, so that the noise of the gong no longer produced catalepsy."

The volume will be of interest to lovers of the marvelous, and of value to the scientific observer.

IV.

A STUDY IN METEMPSYCHOSIS.

THE transmigration of souls is a subject so full of suggestions that it is a wonder some great novelist has not seized upon it as the central idea of a thrilling story. The author of "An Unlaid Ghost"* has in part filled this void in literature, and has produced a novelette which, with some defects of treatment, commends itself as one of originality and power. The historical portion concerns itself with the crimes of Poppæa, wife of the Emperor Nero, who is supposed to be sentenced to live after death in this world in another form, there to endure the anguish of being a cause of misery to others—her very existence bringing a blight upon those she loves. This ends the first part. The second is taken up with the history of a beautiful and lovable girl who is Poppæa *revivibus*, though, of course, she does not know it. The reader follows with keen interest the trials of this maiden, who, indeed, seems to be the victim of some awful and inexplicable doom, in inflicting injury where she only wishes to bless. Things right themselves at last, but in a way the reader could scarcely anticipate. As we have suggested, the story is one of more than ordinary power, holding the reader to rapt attention throughout. The defects are rather of the philosophic order than literary. Poppæa dies humbled and repentant, but her resurrection in the person of the heroine of the second part still seems a rather weak illustration of the doctrine of metempsychosis. We do not recognize Poppæa in the pure and lovable girl who innocently suffers for

* "An Unlaid Ghost; a Study in Metempsychosis." D. Appleton & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her. It is not the imperial murderess, but a substitute enduring the penalty of sins not her own. In fact, the idea of metempsychosis is lost in that of vicarious atonement. The story is a brief one, and, though skilfully told and full of master touches, rather confuses than explains the transmigration theory. One or two of the incidents seem also a little unlikely. The manner in which Sir Ashton forces his attentions upon Hortense is, to say the least, peculiar. There is nothing to lead up to such a dastardly outrage upon common propriety as is perpetrated with such coolness and audacity by a man whose portrait, as here drawn, suggests at least a man of some sense of decency. The young Frenchman's indiscretion is far more natural, since *he* thought the game a fair one and had some logic in his reasoning. But these are mere surface blemishes, and we hope the anonymous writer will feel encouraged to continue his labors in this line of literary effort.

V.

REVELATION AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

THOSE who desire a brief exposition of the leading principles of Catholicism cannot do better than read Mr. Young's translation of Father Broeckaert's treatise entitled, "The Fact Divine."* In the first part of this book evangelical and orthodox Protestants will find little to condemn or even question, as it deals with the subject of the Christian revelation from a standpoint usually accepted by Christians of every school. The main feature of the work is its conciseness. The author, now deceased, spent much of his time as a tutor and professor in Catholic seminaries, and modestly designed this treatise as a kind of text book. There is a certain directness and terseness about the paragraphs which suggest this purpose to the reader, and which make the book very acceptable to those who want to get quickly to the kernel of the subject in hand. Thus, the great question of a First Cause is stated as follows: "The visible objects which surround us have no existence of themselves; therefore they received it from something else, and, in the last analysis, from a First Being, who possesses in Himself the cause of His existence." From this statement a brief logical argument is set forth as to the personality and perfection of God the Creator. One finds no sympathy here with speculative philosophy. Original sin is defined as the loss of the sanctifying grace which God had bestowed upon man with the duty of preserving it, rendering necessary the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. Evangelical Protestants would add "the work of the Holy Spirit." The special providence of God over the Jewish people is recognized as a special miracle, ever pointing to Christ as the Redeemer of the World. "Jesus Christ is God, not by a figurative appellation, nor in the sense of Divine adoption, nor of a favor," but "in the rigorous acceptation of the term." The proof of this is derived from Scripture prophesies, from the life of Christ, the teaching of the Apostles, and the uniform belief of the first Christians. This in no way differs from the orthodox Protestant view, but the reasoning ignores scientific difficulties, which are disposed of *en masse* by the trite remark: "Nature as well as religion has her mysteries." The union of the divine and the human in Christ is pronounced hypostatic—neither nature being absorbed by the other, and as an illustration, the author suggests the union of the body with the soul, or the action of the will upon the movements of the body—mysteries which science accepts without pretending to explain. The term "soul" in this sense need not involve immortality, but simply the inner nature. Even the vital principle

* "The Fact Divine." An Historical Study of the Christian Revelation and of the Catholic Church. By Joseph Broeckaert, S. J. McGowan & Young.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

itself is incomprehensible. The difficulty of understanding the union of the two natures in Christ is not of itself a logical bar to its reception, if demonstrated by other arguments.

The second part of the treatise deals with the Catholic Church as such, and, as one might expect, the position of the author is clearly defined. He has no parley or compromise with Protestant ideas. The authority given to Peter was definite and supreme as the vicar of Christ, and flows onwards to the hierarchy through the Apostles, and the writings of the early Christian Fathers are freely quoted in support of this view. Doctrinal infallibility and spiritual government are the prerogatives of the Church. To substitute one's personal judgment for these is *heresy* and heresy is *sin*, though baptism by heretics in the name of the Trinity is valid. Our author defends the Inquisition as a union of the spiritual and civil powers—the one to establish a crime and the other to punish it. The Spanish Inquisition he regards as on a different footing from the Roman, but he defends it in the main. For the massacre of St. Bartholemew he holds the Church not responsible. As for Luther, Calvin and the other reformers of the Sixteenth Century, he writes in the severest terms, and he rejects the Protestant idea of the Bible as the sole rule of faith. As for the Church of England, which, by retaining the Episcopate, has separated the least from Catholic tradition, he predicts that she is destined either to be absorbed by German naturalism or to resume her place in the Catholic fold—perhaps both, by a process of decomposition. Philosophic speculation and freemasonry are alike inherently bad, foolish and mischievous, and the author concludes with a warm eulogium on the Catholic Church as the one hope of mankind.

We suppose that there is really very little that is new to be said on this great controversy. The prospects for a re-united Christendom are very dark at present, and the claim of the Catholic Church of absolute supremacy and infallibility is scarcely likely to draw together the various powerful forces which have raised the standard of the rights of the individual conscience. The best that both parties can do is, under the shelter of the spirit of toleration now prevailing, to acquaint themselves with each other. In this way they may find some grounds for mutual respect, co-operation and friendship, while differing in some essential particulars.

VI.

A TALE OF SOUTHERN LIFE.

MR. CONWAY'S novel "Pine and Palm"* is exceedingly fascinating as a story pure and simple. It catches the reader up at the beginning, and carries him along to the end, without a moment of indifference or fatigue. The characters, also, are firmly drawn; and if perhaps they err a little on the side of too much virtue, they are sympathetic and pleasing, and to each of them the author has contrived to give a strong and unmistakable individuality. More than this cannot be said of many of the novels that come to the reviewer's table now-a-days.

But over and above its pleasure-giving qualities, "Pine and Palm" possesses an interest and an importance, which will render it indispensable to the library of everybody who wishes to acquire something more than a superficial knowledge of American history. The picture of life on a sea island plantation in *ante-bellum* days, with its careful analysis of the inter-relation of blacks and whites, is evidently not a fancy sketch; and aside from its excellent artistic qualities, its freshness, its breadth, its color, its good humor,—its value as a record of the facts of a

*"Pine and Palm." A Novel. By Moncure D. Conway. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

past phase of American civilization can scarcely be over-rated. This value will be duly appreciated by the future historian of our country, who, wishing to depict the life, as well as to narrate the events, which marked the South in the times immediately preceding the Rebellion, will turn to "Pine and Palm" with no small feeling of gratitude to Mr. Conway for having written it. A like value attaches to the scenes in which grim old Captain John Brown plays a chief part; and to the description of the socialistic colony at Bonheur, under the leadership of the gifted and charming Maria Shelton.

It is not often that one succeeds in writing a novel which shall appeal equally to the light reader and to the serious student; but this is precisely the measure of success which Mr. Conway has achieved.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

D. Appleton & Co.

The Geological History of Plants. Sir J. William Dawson, F.R.S.
The Art of Investing. By a New York broker.
Slips of Tongue and Pen. J. H. Long, M.A.
The Deemster. A Romance of the Isle of Man. Hall Caine.
An Unlaid Ghost. A Study in Metempsychosis.
A Critical History of Sunday Legislation, from 321 to 1888 A.D. A. H. Lewis, D.D.
David Poindexter's Disappearance, and other tales. Julian Hawthorne.
The Story of Colette. From the French.

Chas. Scribner's Sons.

Society in Rome under the Cæsars. William Ralph Inge, M.A.
Bonaventure: A Prose Pastoral of Acadian Louisiana.

T. Y. Crowell & Co.

Maximina. Don Armando Palacio Valdes. Translated by N. H. Dole.
Initials and Pseudonyms. A dictionary of literary disguises. Wm. Cushing, B.A.

Mook Bros. & Co.

Dreamland. A Book of Modern Fairy Tales (4th edition). C. A. Byrne.

McGowan & Young.

The Fact Divine. An historical study of the Christian Revelation, and of the Catholic Church. Joseph Broeckaert, S. J.

Ticknor & Co.

Outlooks on Society, Literature and Politics. Edwin Percy Whipple.
Harvard Reminiscences. Andrew P. Peabody, D.D., LL.D.

The Bancroft Company.

Nerve Waste. H. C. Sawyer, M.D.

Macmillan & Co.

A Study of Religion; Its Sources and Contents. Dr. James Martineau.

D. Lothrop & Co.

The Indian Side of the Indian Question. William Barrows, D.D.
Bybury to Beacon St. Abby Morton Diaz.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED